





HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

THE
HISTORY OF SCOTLAND

FROM AGRICOLA'S INVASION TO THE
EXTINCTION OF THE LAST
JACOBITE INSURRECTION

BY
JOHN HILL BURTON
HISTORIOGRAPHER-ROYAL FOR SCOTLAND

A NEW EDITION, REVISED

IN EIGHT VOLUMES

VOL. V.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCLXXVI

14-94

CONTENTS OF FIFTH VOLUME.

CHAPTER LIII.

THE REGENCY.

	PAGE
Murray's position—His return to Scotland—Consolidation of his power—Dealing with the <u>Hamiltons</u> —Lethington's seizure, and Grange's dealing with him—National calamities—Plague and famine—Execution of Nicholas Hubert—Determination of the <u>Hamiltons</u> to slay Murray—How it was effected—Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh—The popular story of private vengeance disposed of—Queen Mary's feeling on the occasion—The Borderers let loose—English invasion—The dubious policy animating it—Its destructiveness—Regency of <u>Lennox</u> —Exasperation of Scotland—Effect in strengthening Queen Mary's interest—Two parties—Opening of the first thoroughly civil war in Scotland—The taking of Dumbarton Castle—Death of Archbishop <u>Hamilton</u> —The attack on Stirling—The death of <u>Lennox</u> ,	1-42

CHAPTER LIV.

THE REGENCY.

(Continued.)

Mar succeeding Lennox—The war continued in Edinburgh—Kirkcaldy of Grange and his escapades—His quarrel with Knox—Knox and others on praying for the queen—Knox's

danger—Final discussion in the castle between Knox on the one hand and Grange and Lethington on the other—The policy of Lethington—His appeal to France—The accompanying revelations about the danger of the queen's cause—The nature of the contest—The Gordons in the north—The battle of the Craibstone—The burning of the House of Towie—Readjustment of the Church—Tulchan bishops—Knox's departure from Edinburgh—His position with the brethren—His return and death—Death of the Regent Mar, . . . 43-88

CHAPTER LV.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

Election of a new regent—Morton chosen—His dealing with Northumberland—Influence in Scotland of the Massacre of St Bartholomew—Leslie, Bishop of Ross—His defence of Queen Mary—Acts as her ambassador in England—The political relation which gave his mission the style of an embassy—Morton called to London—The diplomatic farce performed there—Talk of the marriage of Mary and the Duke of Anjou—Plots of the Bishop of Ross and Rudolphi—Difficulties with the bishop as an ambassador—The Pope's bull against Queen Elizabeth—Joint influence of the plot and the massacre in England—Pressure for putting Queen Mary to death—Question of a plan for sending her to Scotland to be slain—Killigrew's mission—The old queen's party drawn off—Grange and Lethington left, 89-115

CHAPTER LVI.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

(Continued.)

End of the truce, and recommencement of the war—Lethington and Grange in the Castle of Edinburgh—A Parliament in the town—England committed to the king's party, and aid sent—The siege of the castle—The capture and destruction—Fate of Grange—The story of Knox's prophecies—Lethington's end—Morton, and the completion of his power—Quietness in the

country—The young king—His training and his teachers—
 Buchanan and Young—Buchanan's projects for the rearing of
 a perfect monarch—Their result—Morton and ecclesiastical
 affairs—Conditions of the retention of the old hierarchy—The
 Huguenot and the Puritan influences—John Craig—Andrew
 Melville, 116-151

CHAPTER LVII.

EXPIRY OF THE REGENCY.

Peace and a strong Government—Prosperity—Revenue—En-
 forcement of Crown rights—Story of the recovery of the Crown
 jewels—Morton's difficulties—His power trembling—Ques-
 tions about the custody of the king—A Parliament in Stirling
 Castle—The king accepts the "regiment"—A great reconcilia-
 tion banquet—The suspicious death of Athole—Death of the
 Duke of Chatelherault—Breaking up of the Hamilton power—
 Esmé Stewart of Aubigné comes from France—Difficulties
 about his religion—Settled by conformity—His alarming influ-
 ence—Mission of Bowes to deal with it—Rise of Captain James
 Stewart—His services in assailing Morton—The struggle—
 Morton crushed—His trial and execution—The futile projects
 —The Raid of Ruthven—The fall of Aubigné—King James
 and Bowes in conference—The "Association" project—Nego-
 tiation between Bowes and Ruthven about the Casket Letters
 —Breaking up of the Ruthven power, 152-200

CHAPTER LVIII.

JAMES VI. TO THE LEAGUE WITH ENGLAND.

The influence of the Church on the political situation—Retro-
 spect on the rise of this influence—The great revival—The
 claims of the ecclesiastical estate—The Second Book of Disci-
pline—The first Covenant or King's Confession—Germs of Pres-
 byterian influence—The young king and the contending influ-
 ences—The political doctrines of Buchanan—His death—Dis-
 posal of the Ruthven party—The banished lords at Newcastle

with the banished Church—How they endured discipline—
 Struggle between Arran and Ruthven—Ruthven's fall and
 execution—The pernicious supremacy of Arran—A Border
 squabble—Works to Arran's ruin—The Master of Gray—The
 league with England, 201-240

CHAPTER LIX.

TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN MARY AND THE SPANISH ARMADA.

England preparing for a blow—Queen Mary—Her isolation from
 the politics of Scotland—Influence through her negotiations
 and plots on the politics of England—Her life since the affair
 of Rudolphi and the Bishop of Ross part of English history—
 General outline of her personal history as a captive in England
 —Tutbury, Leeds Castle, and the other places of her detention
 —Her appeals to Elizabeth—Her humility—The attack of
 sarcastic vituperation—Her renunciation of her son—Her
 claim to the crown of England never dropped—Bequeaths her
 kingdoms to Philip of Spain—The execution—How taken in
 Scotland—Philip comes to take possession—The Armada—
 Incidents in Scotland connected with it—The king's majority
 —His pacification pageant—Placid condition of the coun-
 try, 241-270

CHAPTER LX.

TO THE REACTION OF EPISCOPACY.

The king's marriage projects—Anne of Denmark—King James's
 one romance—His voyage to Scandinavia to bring home his
 wife—Their return and reception—Formal adoption of the
 Presbyterian polity—The new blood thrown into the Presby-
 terian party—Andrew Melville—Story of Stewart, Earl of
 Bothwell—His escapades—The adherents of the old Church
 —Huntly and the northern Romanists—The mystery of the
 Spanish blanks—The battle of Glenlivet—The Popish Earls—
 The ceremonial of their repentance and reconciliation to the
 Church—The triumphs of the Melville party—The contest with
 the Court—The scene in Edinburgh—Flight and return of the
 Court—Reaction, 271-312

CHAPTER LXI.

TO THE UNION OF THE CROWNS.

Contest with the ecclesiastics—Their criticism on the king as an author—Episcopacy again triumphant—The king hunting in Falkland—Beguiled to Gowrie House—The adventure there known as the Gowrie Conspiracy—The revelations showing the immediate intention of the conspirators—The mystery about their ultimate objects—Political influence of this mystery—The doubts and difficulties of the clergy—Position of the English succession—Confidential correspondence—English statesmen turning to the rising sun—The announcement of the death of Queen Elizabeth, 313-358

CHAPTER LXII.

UNION OF THE CROWNS.

King James's departure—Reception at Berwick—The royal progress—Feastings—Pageants—Hunting—English and Scots field-sports—The king's delight with his new dominions—Personal sketches of the new Court—The king himself—His motley character—Contrast to his mother—Queen Anne, her wit, her influence—Prince Henry—Prince Charles—Glimpses of the interior of the palace—Correspondence of royal children, 359-393

CHAPTER LXIII.

JAMES VI.

Political conditions following on the union of the crowns—Effect of the removal of the Court—Resort of the Scots to England—The popular charges against them of beggary, greed, and filth—Question how far these are justified—Addition to England of industrious inhabitants—Project of incorporating union—Repeal of antagonistic laws—The great case of the *postnati*, or right of persons born after the union to common citizenship—Moral effect of the decision—Lord Bacon on the question—Navigation restrictions—Local affairs in Scotland—The discoveries about the Gowrie Conspiracy—Revelations of Sprot—Logan of Restalrig, 394-421

CHAPTER LXIV.

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

Millenary petition—Hampton Court conference—King James's retaliation on his Presbyterian tormentors—Adulation of the English clergy—How the king took it—Steps to an authorised version of the Bible—Effect of the conference in Scotland—The “Popes of Edinburgh”—Contest of the clergy and the Crown—Assembly at Aberdeen—The south and the north—The king's letter—Trial of Welsh and his brethren—Andrew Melville and his followers drawn to London—Their treatment there—Death and character of Melville—Remodelling of the Church—Restoration of Episcopacy—The revenues of the old Church—How the attempts to obtain them for the new bishops were defeated—Incidents of the contest, and the personal and pecuniary interests concerned in it—The bishops in the Highlands and the Isles, 422-461

THE HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.



CHAPTER LIIL.

THE REGENCY.

MURRAY'S POSITION—HIS RETURN TO SCOTLAND—CONSOLIDATION OF HIS POWER—DEALING WITH THE HAMILTONS—LETHINGTON'S SEIZURE, AND GRANGE'S DEALING WITH HIM—NATIONAL CALAMITIES—PLAGUE AND FAMINE—EXECUTION OF NICHOLAS HUBERT—DETERMINATION OF THE HAMILTONS TO SLAY MURRAY—HOW IT WAS EFFECTED—HAMILTON OF BOTHWELLHAUGH—THE POPULAR STORY OF PRIVATE VENGEANCE DISPOSED OF—QUEEN MARY'S FEELING ON THE OCCASION—THE BORDERERS LET LOOSE—ENGLISH INVASION—THE DUBIOUS POLICY ANIMATING IT—ITS DESTRUCTIVENESS—REGENCY OF LENNOX—EXASPERATION OF SCOTLAND—EFFECT IN STRENGTHENING QUEEN MARY'S INTEREST—TWO PARTIES—OPENING OF THE FIRST THOROUGHLY CIVIL WAR IN SCOTLAND—THE TAKING OF DUMBARTON CASTLE—DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP HAMILTON—THE ATTACK ON STIRLING—THE DEATH OF LENNOX.

FROM the flight of Queen Mary to the return of the regent, the attention of all men seems to have been so exclusively bent on the momentous discussion in England, as to leave nothing to be told of Scotland. Murray kept his force together, and it seems to have been sufficient to put down any actual resistance. He concentrated it round Edinburgh, that a meeting of the Estates might be held in the usual constitutional manner to deal with the emergency.

In the middle of June he would receive Queen Elizabeth's letter of admonition already referred to, in which, considering the government of the realm as in his power, she charged him "utterly to forbear from all manner of hostility and persecution against all such as have lately taken part with the said queen, and to suspend all manner of actions and proceedings against them both by law and arms; as the like is meant by us to be observed on the queen's part."¹ Queen Elizabeth had taken on herself to settle the great question, and therefore enjoined both parties to suspend action until she had given judgment. Queen Mary assented to this arrangement. There was much counter-recrimination by each party against the other as false to the terms of this truce. But it was one that could not have been kept. As an absolute injunction it existed only in the command of the Queen of England, a thing utterly worthless in Scotland. Even if Queen Mary's directions to her adherents were honest, they would be guided by events and opportunities. As to Murray, he was in the hands of the victorious party. The measure that of all others was the most formidable to their enemy—their meeting as the Estates of the realm in Parliament—was announced, and could not be forborne. Huntly gathered his followers of the north, Argyle brought the west, and the Hamiltons joined. They gathered a considerable force, and afterwards remonstrated to Queen Elizabeth that they had obeyed the order of their mistress "to stay all hostility and invasion on the Earl of Murray and his accomplices," but that, nevertheless, the Parliament had been held, and had dealt with them as enemies.²

The Estates met on the 12th of July, and adjourned to the 16th of August in order that the weighty business to be transacted by them might be put into shape. Thirty persons were arraigned for trial, seventeen of them bearing the name of Hamilton. Chatelherault was in France, and could not be implicated in the sudden rising; but his sons, Arran and Lord Claud, were among the accused,

¹ Anderson, iv. 69

² Ibid., 125, 126.

along with the real head of the house, John, the archbishop. The list of Hamiltons ends with "David Hamilton, son to the gudeman of Bothwellhaugh."¹ A supplementary accusation brought in Herries and his son, and their special supporters. Each indictment was in Latin, after the solemn form of the High Court of Parliament. Had the queen's party been victorious at Langside, there would have been the usual formalities for the attainder and punishment of rebels. This would have been in natural sequence, and neither history nor the statute-book would have carried the burden of an anomaly strange and unnatural in the eyes of many good people. The proceedings did not suffer in their external formalities, indeed these seemed to be accumulated with anxious pains to cover all defects of title. The accused were charged with rebellion against King James ; and that they were seduced to this course by his majesty's mother, who attempted to usurp his crown, is set forth as if it were in some measure an aggravation of their guilt. The overt act of treason was an attack on his majesty's forces under the command of his majesty's *consanguineus*, the lawfully-appointed regent of his kingdom. The regal tone was of course necessary ; but to a modern eye its efficiency seems hardly to be supported by something like a pleading for its assumption : it tells that nothing could be a more complete divestiture than the ex-queen made of her crown, nothing more complete than the investiture of his present majesty. He was as fully King of Scots now as she was Queen of Scots before her abdication, and in the whole illustrious roll of Scots monarchs there was not one whose title was more spotless than the king who now ruled over Scotland.²

The real terrors of the process lay behind all these pompous formalities. The accused persons would not, of course, attend the meeting of Estates, and place them-

¹ The term "goodman" is not a testimony to his virtues, but indicates that he held his estate not in freehold from the Crown, but as the vassal of a subject-superior.

² See the proceedings, Act. Parl., iii. 45 *et seq.*

selves in the hands of their enemies. Not appearing, they were formally "forefaulted" or outlawed. This means that they and their possessions were at the mercy of the ruling party. No further process was necessary for conferring the power to put them to death or seize their estates. Whatever befell them, no one could point to a flaw or irregularity in the procedure by which they had been ruined. It remained for events to determine what use the victorious party would make of their formidable powers.

In January 1569, Murray returned from the conferences. On the face of the recorded transactions their conclusion was a blank ; and Murray had gained nothing for all his outlay of patience, sagacity, personal risk, and even humiliation. But in reality he had gained everything. There was to be a little more blustering by Queen Elizabeth about the sacredness of the sovereign and the duty of the subject ; but the power of the Protestant Government of England was thrown into Murray's cause, and the new settlement of the throne was as firm as any political condition could be in those days of confusion. This was a final blow to the Hamiltons, and they were driven to desperate resolutions. Not only was the man who held in his hand the confiscation of their estates elevated to a firm supremacy, but the revolution affected their interest through a peculiar genealogical condition, which must have been in their view from the beginning, but was now becoming matter of practical discussion. We have seen how distant was that connection with the house of Stewart which sufficed to make them the nearest family to the throne : it came of their ancestress, a daughter of James II.¹ If the child who stood between them "and home" were to die, as they might well anticipate, then they would be his mother's heirs ; and if she died without issue in possession of a throne, they would be her heirs in it. But the Duke of Chatelherault was not the nearest heir of King James. That right would fall to his father's brother Charles, afterwards Earl of Lennox,

¹ See above, chap. xxix.

the father of one chiefly known by the misfortunes which followed her illustrious birth—Arabella Stewart.¹

The head of the house of Hamilton was still absent in France. We have met him before, when his placid temper and luxurious indolence provoked the more stirring spirits who desired to play a game with his birthright, and the lapse of a quarter of a century had not quickened his blood.

At this crisis he was dragged back by his supporters. He received from Queen Mary a commission as lieutenant-general of the kingdom, with Argyle and Huntly as lieutenants—the one for the south, the other for the north. When they attempted to gather the scattered followers of their parties, it was found that Murray's concentrated and well-ordered force was too strong for them, and it was necessary to submit. The regent was passing through Glasgow early in March, to attack the Hamiltons at home, when they proposed terms of compromise, to be the base of a specific contract. They were, on the one part, to acknowledge the new order, give their allegiance to King James, and obey his regent. In return, they were to have an amnesty for past offences, including, of course, a revocation of the forfeitures. Some points were left vague,—as the adoption of such conditions as might “redound to our sovereign lord's mother's honour, advancement, and commodity.” On this and the general completion of

¹ Sussex, in a letter already cited (chap. lii.), says: “The Hamiltons affirm the Duke of Chatelherault to be the next heir by the laws. The other faction say that the young king by his coronation and mother's surrender is rightfully invested of the crown of Scotland, whereby his next heir in blood is by the laws next heir also to the crown, and thereby the duke avoided. The fear of this device makes Hamilton to withstand the king's title for the surety of his own, and the regency of Murray, in respect of his claim to be governor, or next heir to the crown; for which causes it is likely Hamilton will hardly yield to the one or the other; and yet James Macgill, an assured man to Morton, talks with me secretly of this matter, and (defending the right of the Earl of Lennox's son as next heir in blood to the young king) confessed to me that he thought because it came by the mother it must return by the law to the mother's side, which was Hamilton, but it would put many men on horseback before it were performed.” —Lodge's *Illustrations of British History*, i. 462.

the agreement a committee of the chief men concerned should assemble on the 10th of April in Edinburgh "in quiet and peaceable manner." They were to be Chatelherault himself, Huntly, Argyle, Athole, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Herries.¹

Although this transaction had the outward aspect of a bargain between two high contracting parties, it was in reality the policy adopted by a government in a position to dictate, and it was a policy that might be changed, if necessary, until there was a distinct public guarantee given to the weaker party. It is well to keep this in view, as some of the subsequent acts of the regency have been spoken of as a gross breach of faith. No reliance was placed on the faith of the Hamiltons and the queen's party. Hostages were demanded from them—the Earl of Cassilis or his brother, Herries's heir the Master of Maxwell, and one of the duke's sons. We are told that the duke could not prevail on either of his sons to run the risk of being put in pledge for the conduct of the party. His zealous brother, the Archbishop of St Andrews, accepted the responsibility, entering himself as a prisoner in Stirling Castle.² Yet the regent was not satisfied with this suretiship, and when the duke and Herries came to Edinburgh to adjust the final terms he placed them both in restraint.³ That he might have strong reason for this we may easily infer by finding that Huntly's Highlanders were let loose on the king's party in the north, and were busily harrying their territories. Murray marched northwards with a force so strong that he did not require to fight. He held his court at Aberdeen, and summoned the chief offenders to attend him there and make their submission. The occasion was made notable by the severe application of a peculiar form of coercion which we shall find of frequent use in Scotland—a form essentially the creature of wealth and a certain progress in civilisation. It substituted for the sword and the cord the pressure of the civil law, by sparing recusants on their undertaking pecuniary obligations. Murray laid his fines so heavily

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 140, 141.

² Ibid., 142.

³ Ibid. 144.

on the northern chiefs and lairds that, as a contemporary chronicler says, "they componed for sic sums of money as they were not able to pay; for there was never seen or heard in this realm in times bygone that sic mean gentlemen as these are that paid sic great sums of money as they did. In the mean time there was nane within the bounds of the north but they were subdued to the king's authority, and were compelled to acknowledge the same."¹

England was now shaken by the great northern rebellion. The events of it belong to the history of England, and have only to be treated here as they concern the complicated intrigues of Queen Mary and her friends. It had meanwhile the effect of rendering Queen Elizabeth's Government and the regent's more completely one cause. This, like most political forces, had its reactionary balance. There were already two strong parties against the regent—the queen's party, almost identical with the party of the old Church, and the Hamiltons. Those who themselves believed, or could make others believe, that the regent was subservient to England, could easily make a third, which might become more powerful than either, for the fires of the old national jealousy still smouldered in the hearts of the people. Besides the Parliamentary forfeitures, the regent had another very powerful hold over a select few who might prove dangerous—he could bring home to them a complicity in the murder of Darnley sufficient to drag them to the scaffold. Lethington and Balfour were both in this position, and both were becoming more and more suspected. Balfour was apprehended. There was a suspicious gathering at Dunkeld, at which were present the Earl of Athole, the queen's steady friend Lord Seaton, and Lethington. In the words of a contemporary chronicler, "It is said that they were at the hunting there; but the same was heavily murmured that they were devising some things touching the queen's coming home, and the wrecking of James Earl of Murray and his affairs."²

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 145.

² Ibid., 147. The name in the original is Morton, not Murray,

There was to be a general convention at Stirling, the origin of which is not sufficiently accounted for by the current understanding that it was for the purpose of receiving a message from Queen Elizabeth about Queen Mary. Lethington was there with the others, when Craufurd of Jordanhill—the same who bore testimony to the meeting of Mary and her husband at Glasgow—appeared, and demanded audience on a weighty matter. He represented the old Earl of Lennox, his kinsman, and in his name denounced Lethington as one of the murderers of the late king. Of course there were those present to whom this apparition was no surprise. Lethington was seized and conveyed to Edinburgh as a criminal. But here the regent encountered a very curious dilemma. The castle was the place in which such a captive should be detained—the only place, indeed, sufficiently retentive to afford any chance of his safe custody. The chivalrous Grange was the governor of the castle. He was placed there by the regent; but doubts were arising whether he was to hold it for the regent's Government, and the justice of these doubts was soon to be confirmed. Murray tried to secure his prisoner, but Grange settled the question by sending a party in the night, who seized him and conveyed him within the castle. Murray was fain to let the matter pass. The man was in his right place, the whole transaction had in its externals the aspect of a due administration of the law, and it was not the time for putting Grange's loyalty to the issue.¹

With all this, the regent's hands were full of business elsewhere. The confusions in the north of England had given brilliant opportunities to the Border rievvers to resume their old work. Murray paid them more than one visit, and chastised them so that, as the contemporary chronicler already often cited tells us, "it is said there was such obedience made by the said thieves to the said regent as the like was 'never done to na king in na man's days of before.'" ² There was still another element in this sea

evidently from a slip, which seems to show that Morton must have become regent before the passage was written.

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 148.

² Ibid., 151.

of troubles. A grievous famine visited the land. The famine was either accompanied or followed by "the peste." This visitation was accompanied by all those utterances of cruelty and selfishness which it takes a high cast of civilisation to drive from the companionship of such a curse.¹ One of the evil features by which men show how much of their reason is taken away from them by such a visitant is, that they are apt to denounce their rulers as the cause of all.

In this year of 1569 there remains to be dealt with a small item of the latest great State tragedy ere the stage is cleared for another. The hapless French page, Nicholas Hubert, commonly known as French Paris, whose revela-

¹ "According to custom in Edinburgh, when this dire visitor made his appearance, the families which proved to be infected were compelled to remove, with all their goods and furniture, out to the Burgh-moor, where they lodged in wretched huts hastily erected for their accommodation. They were allowed to be visited by their friends, in company with an officer, after eleven in the forenoon; any one going earlier was liable to be punished with death, as were those who concealed the pest in their houses. Their clothes were meanwhile purified by boiling in a large caldron erected in the open air, and their houses were 'clengit' by the proper officers. All these regulations were under the care of two citizens selected for the purpose, and called *Bailies of the Murr*; for each of whom, as for the cleansers and bearers of the dead, a gown of grey was made, with a white St Andrew's cross before and behind, to distinguish them from other people. Another arrangement of the day was, 'that there be made twa close biers, with four feet, coloured over with black; and (ane) white cross, with ane bell to be hung upon the side of the said bier, whilk sall mak warning to the people.'

"The public policy was directed rather to the preservation of the untainted than to the recovery of the sick. In other words, selfishness ruled the day. The inhumanity towards the humbler classes was dreadful. Well might *Maister Gilbert Skene, Doctor in Medicine*, remark in his little tract on the pest, now printed in Edinburgh, 'Every ane is become sae detestable to other (whilk is to be lamentit), and specially the puir in the sight of the rich, as gif they were not equal with them touching their creation, but rather without saul or spirit, as beests degenerate fra mankind.' This worthy mediciner tells us, indeed, that he was partly moved to publish his book by 'seand the puir in Christ inlaik (perish) without assistance of support in body, all men detestand aspection, speech, or communication with them.'"—Chambers's *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, i. 52, 53.

tions have been amply cited, was executed on the 16th of August as an accessory to the crime of the Kirk-of-Field. Both what we know and what we do not know of the conditions surrounding his death have been made of moment through the importance imputed to them by the vindicators of Queen Mary, and therefore it is necessary to note them. The execution was not in Edinburgh but in St Andrews, and no record of the trial or judgment has been preserved. To these facts, deemed suspicious, it has been recently added, that when Queen Elizabeth suggested to Murray that the execution might be deferred, he answered that it was already over; and in his letter to her he stated that Hubert had arrived from Denmark at Leith in the middle of the preceding month of June, whereas he had sailed from Denmark on the 15th of October 1568. The inference from this discrepancy is, that Murray had him in hand during the progress of the York and London conference, that he could thus have produced him as a witness, and that to conceal this suppression of evidence he had told a falsehood about the time of Hubert's arrival in Scotland.¹

¹ See the case stated with all due power in Hosack, 244. Were it worth entering on the matter, it might be pleaded that the charge of falsehood is made against Murray on very fragile evidence—merely from “Anderson’s notes of letters in the Paper Office.” As printed by Malcolm Laing (ii. 269) there is this passage: “True it is that the said Paris arrived at Leith about the midst of June last, I at that time being in the north parts of this realm far distant; whereupon it followed that at my returning, after diligent and circumspect examination of him, and lang time spent in that behalf, upon the xvi day of August bypast he suffered death by order of law, so that before the receipt of your highness’s letter by the space of seven or eight days he was execut.”

The absence of all record of the trial is a feature only too common, as many of the criminal records of the sixteenth century have been lost. There is nothing exceptional in St Andrews being the place of trial and execution. We shall find that a renowned State trial of a few years later—that of Lord Balmerinoch—was held there. Hubert had a companion sufferer on a charge having no connection with his own. A contemporary note-maker says: “William Stewart, sometime Lyon King of Arms, being suspected for art and part of the conspiring of my lord regent’s slaughter, and brought to the Castle of Edinburgh out of Dumbarton, and also Paris—Frenchman—being

To avoid the imputation of carelessness, it is necessary to mention casually, before entering on matter of more vivid interest, that a convention of the Estates of the realm was held at Perth in July 1569. The meeting did not resolve itself into a formal Parliament, and no record of its proceedings has been preserved. Nominally the business submitted to the assembly was very important—to consider a message from Queen Elizabeth on the question of Queen Mary's restoration. But that was a question dismissed from all practical consideration. It held a place in the negotiations between the English Government and the Regency merely as a matter of etiquette, because Queen Elizabeth had sanctioned no formal acknowledgment of a government created by subjects in defiance of sovereigns. Perhaps the most important result of the meeting was, that the question of the Norfolk marriage came before it; and a discussion of this affair, in itself desultory and purposeless, revealed some unpleasant facts to the Queen of England's advisers. The rebellion which followed scarcely touched Scotland; but Murray, apprehensive of co-operation between the English and the Scots supporters of the old religion, summoned the feudal power of the country to meet him on the Border. He met no enemy, and he was so successful as to catch the Earl of Northumberland, who on the breaking up of the rebel force sought safety on the north side of the Border. This was a valuable prize, as it gave the ruler of Scotland a stake which he might play against the English Government. The acquisition seemed opportune, for Murray was at that time negotiating for the transference of his sister to Scotland. With what view he

brought out of Denmark, and one of the slayers of our sovereign lord's father, to the said Castle of Edinburgh, were both tane out of the said castle to St Andrews, there to be punished according to their demerits."—*Diurnal of Occurrents*, 146; see also the *Historie of King James the Sext*, 41. The method of Stewart's machinations against the regent's life was by "sorcery and necromancy" (*Balfour's Annals*, i. 343).

The time of the page's removal from Denmark is certified by Professor Schiern of Copenhagen (*Hosack*, 245). See the reference made, at the end of the preceding chapter, to his book on Bothwell.

sought an acquisition likely to be so troublesome it is hard to find. Later acts might have revealed his policy, but it was in the decrees of fate that time should be denied for the development of this as well as of the many other schemes then occupying his busy brain.

The Hamilton party had determined to put him to death, and the affair was undertaken by one of themselves, James Hamilton, commonly called "Bothwellhaugh." A story converting this well-planned murder into a frantic act of retribution for certain deeds of fiendish cruelty has found its way into ordinary history, though it bears on its face the palpable characteristics of romance.

As the story goes, Hamilton had made a sacrifice of his paternal estate of Bothwellhaugh in his loyalty to his queen, by fighting for her at Langside, and so falling to be dealt with by that law of treason which the victor ever has at his command. His wife was heiress of the pleasant domain of Woodhouselee, and this he believed to be safe from the perils following his imprudent loyalty. He was mistaken. Woodhouselee was forfeited to enrich a greedy favourite of the regent ; and the new-comer seized on his spoil with such heartless rapacity, that although the wife of Bothwellhaugh was enduring that ordeal which gives woman the strongest claim on the sympathy of man, he drove her forth on a winter night with her infant, to wander along the bleak hillside until death came to her relief. Some transactions there were about lands which Bothwellhaugh enjoyed in right of his wife ; but the nature of these transactions gives them the aspect of a family arrangement to preserve them from forfeiture for treason committed by Bothwellhaugh. But if this be not absolutely proved, another fact is sufficient for the extinction of the fable—that the lady was afterwards living at Bothwellhaugh while her husband was a fugitive for the murder of the regent.¹

¹ On the point whether Hamilton forfeited, in the first place, his own estate of Bothwellhaugh for his loyalty to his queen, the available documents leave it doubtful whether he ever possessed such an estate. It belonged to his father, but it appears to have continued in the family after James Hamilton would certainly have lost it by for-

On the 23d of February 1570 his opportunity came. The regent, on his way from Stirling to Edinburgh, was then to ride in state through Linlithgow. The Hamiltons had a strong feudal influence in the surrounding district, and could thus make their preparations among themselves.

feiture had it been his. It may be conjectured that an elder brother succeeded to the family estate, and that James only got the patronymic of Bothwellhaugh, according to the Scots practice, which often distributed the name of the estate over the family generally as a title of courtesy. The point is scarcely of sufficient importance in history to court a close investigation. On the second question, the fate of his wife's estate of Woodhouselee, we have more light. It was not forfeited, but was voluntarily conveyed away. The person to whom it was conveyed, Bellenden the justice-clerk, might be termed a rapacious favourite ; but he was at the same time the uncle of the heiress, and it is pretty clear that the object of the conveyance was to place the estate for a time in his strong hands, in order that it might be safe from any possible risk of forfeiture for the acts of the lady's husband. Thus if the regent or his Government committed any irregularity, it was in conniving at a project for defeating a harsh law. But a curious little incident preserved by the pedantries of a legal formality is more effective for the destruction of the romance. When Hamilton was afterwards forfeited by Act of Parliament, a writ had to be personally served on him or left at his dwelling-place. The officer intrusted with this duty left on record that he went to the house of Bothwellhaugh, where James Hamilton usually resided. He was naturally not at home ; but the officer found his wife, and put the writ in her hands. She, however, like a cautious woman, refused to receive or acknowledge the writ (Act. Parl., iii. 133).

It would appear that the custody in which the estate was placed was but too safe and fast, since it was only after long suit that the lady regained her own. It may be noted that there were two sisters co-heiresses of Woodhouselee, and that they married two brothers, James and David Hamilton. In January 1592, when the Hamiltons were powerful, there is an Act of Council to the effect that "Isobel Sinclair and Alison Sinclair, heretrices-portioners of the lands of Woodhouselee, ought and should be repossessed to the lands, houses, tacks, steadings, and possessions whereof they were dispossessed through occasion of the late troubles" (Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, i. 266). Ere this time Bellenden was dead, as well as his son and successor. Whoever held Woodhouselee, however, a higher force was necessary to open his grasp. In 1609 an Act of the Estates was passed to give effect to the order of Council seventeen years earlier, and to restore to Isobel and Alison Sinclair their estate of Woodhouselee (Act. Parl., iv. 450). If there be any doubt about the object of the alienation of the property, there can be none that the

The structure of the old Scots towns favoured such a deed. They were generally laid out in one narrow street, with gardens radiating outwards on either side. These the enemy might destroy; but the backs of the houses formed

victim of the Pentland Hills some time just before the year 1570 was alive thirty-nine years later.

The cradle of the popular story will be found in the 'History and Life of King James the Sext,' a book in which the narrative of a probably fair contemporary is mixed up with other matter not to be relied on. It thence passed into the 'Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland,' by David Crawford of Drumsay, Historiographer-Royal to Queen Anne. It had fit companionship with the crowd of falsehoods which provoked Malcolm Laing to call the book "the earliest, if not the most impudent, literary forgery ever practised in Scotland" (Hist. James VI., preface, p. vi). By Crawford the story was put thus: Bothwellhaugh being one of "the bold and loyal men" of the Hamilton clan, "his wife, who was heiress of Woodhouselee, not thinking her husband's crimes would affect her estate, willingly abandoned that of Bothwellhaugh, which was his ancient patrimony, and possessed herself of her own. But Murray, being informed of the matter by Sir James Ballantyne (a mighty favourite of his, to whom he had gifted Woodhouselee), sent some officers to take possession of the house, who not only turned the gentlewoman out of doors, but stripped her naked, and left her in that condition in the open field in a cold dark night, where before day she became furiously mad, and insensible of the injury they had done her. From this moment it was that Hamilton resolved upon Murray's death," &c.—Memoirs, 124. Being accepted by Principal Robertson, this story took its place in legitimate history, and it was naturally completed by the additional decorations of the new-born babe and the mother's death. This strangely-fabricated story has the one merit that it inspired one of the noblest of modern ballads—Scott's "Cadyow Castle." Some curious information on the matters here referred to, and others connected with them, will be found in a quarter where it might not be sought for—the notes by Mr Maidment to the 'Scottish Ballads and Songs, Historical and Traditionary,' ii. 39, 331.

Mr Maidment thinks he can identify another unfortunate lady to answer the question—

"What sheeted phantom wanders wild
Where mountain Esk through woodland flows?"

His substitute is the heroine of that sad sweet ballad "The Lady Anne Bothwell's Lament." He traces "The Lady Anne" to Anne, daughter of Bothwell, that Bishop of Orkney who married the queen to her Bothwell. Mr Maidment supposes that she lived at Glencorse, near Woodhouselee, and that in her miseries she became insane and died the mother of an illegitimate child: "The vicinity of Woodhouselee to Glencorse, the similarity of Bothwell to Bothwellhaugh,

a sort of wall, and protected the actual town from invasion. The arrangement was conducive to health as well as protection; but it afforded opportunities for mischief, and frequently those concerned in street-brawls could escape through their own houses into the open country. A house, belonging, according to the concurring testimony of contemporaries, to Archbishop Hamilton, was found to suit the purpose, as facing the principal street. Horses and all other means were ready for escape westward into the chief territory of the Hamiltons, where they were absolute. There was a balcony in front with hangings on it. Perhaps the citizens did honour to the occasion by displaying their finery, and this house appeared to be decorated like the others.¹ We hear of warnings of his danger having reached the ear of the regent; but he was not a man easily flustered or alarmed, and took no further heed to what was said save that he thought it prudent to pass rapidly forward. In this, however, he was impeded by the crowd. The murderer had to deal with the delays and difficulties of the clumsy hackbut of the day; but he did his work to perfection. The bullet passed through the body between the waist and the thigh, and retained impetus enough to kill a horse near the regent's side. He remained some hours alive; but he knew his fate, and met it with the calm bravery of his nature.

His character must be considered as told in his actions. These have almost been buried under much unseemly controversy about his motives and secret intentions. Where real events are so numerous and significant, they surely afford sufficient ground for criticism without passing into the region of the imagined and the suspected. His position

the belief in the pretended miserable death of the heiress of the former estate, and the real death of the living lady's cousin in the same locality, got in process of time to be all so much mixed up together that the popular error is not at all surprising."—*Ibid.*, 332.

¹ In an old narrative—not, however, as we have seen, worthy of much reliance—it is said that "upon the pavement of the said gallery he laid a feather-bed, and upon the window thereof he affixed black cloths, that his shadow might not be seen nor his feet heard when he went to or fro."—*Historie of King James the Sext*, 46.

might have given him opportunities for acts more unscrupulous than any committed by him. We have seen that his share in the rewards of the period was originally an office nominally ecclesiastical—that of Prior of St Andrews. The reason given for this choice was, that it would be unsafe to advance to an office of civil or military power one who was so near the throne. It was destined that he should concentrate in his hands all the powers, civil and military, of the State; yet he gave no one a right to hold that he intended to apply these powers to any evil purpose. His policy was as thoroughly constitutional as that of the English statesmen who promoted the Revolution of 1688 and the Hanover succession. The difficulties in the way of a firm order of government, and the temptations to turn to selfish ends these difficulties, were both great—but he bid fair to conquer the one, and he left no sign that he would yield to the other. So natural a thing was his grasping at the sceptre considered, that a bold attempt was made to convince the people of its reality. After his death the country was excited by an account of a secret conference in which Knox, Lord Lindsay, and some others had offered their services to make him king, and he had accepted the offer. It professed to be the notes taken of the conference by one hidden in the room where it was held. It was found in the end to be a fabrication; but it was a clever one, likely to be received as a genuine history. All the characters were well sustained; and perhaps that of Knox, the most difficult of all, was the happiest. It was thoroughly in tone; but instead of imitating the great ecclesiastical wrestler in the whirlwind of his passion, according to the usual practice of the mimic, who finds the exaggerated features to be easiest of imitation, this artist presented Knox in his grave and moderate tone, as of one feeling the weight of a heavy responsibility. In allusion to Lethington he could not away with the “jolly wits and politic brains” of Macchiavelli’s disciples. What did they all see? The Gospel triumphant and Antichrist overthrown. Were they to risk all by losing him who had done this good work? Let the Good Regent reign as long as he lives; “for when this

bairn whom we call now king shall come to age, does any man think that he will leave all royal insolence and suffer himself to be ruled according to the simplicity of the evangel? What good hope can we have of the child born of such parents? I will not speak of this suspicion may be concerning the man that was killed; but though he be his whose he is called, what can we look for but, as it were, the heritage of the slain's lightness and the mother's iniquity? If John Knox's counsel be followed, the estate of the evangel and professors thereof shall never be given over to such by hazard. Better it is to be content with ourselves, with him in whose majesty we have good experience both in wealth and trouble, than to change frae the gravity of ane aged ruler to the intemperancy of ane unbridled child." He alluded with exultation to the verification of the predictions in his 'Blast against the Regiment of Women,' and announced that he had ready for the press "a book wherein I prove by sufficient reasons that all kings, princes, and rulers goes not by succession, and that birth has no power to promote nor bastardy to seclude men from government." He ended by expressing a belief that if his grace were advanced to the throne "by God," he would punish without pity "all that displease the Church," and would "provide that the servants of God be honourably entreated with ane proportion of this common wealth according to their calling." Murray's remarks were equally happy: "Ye know I was never ambitious; but I will not oppose myself to the will of God revealed by you which are His true minister." And at the conclusion, "It was ane heavy burden that lay upon him, and that he would underlie the same as well as he might, and depend on their counsel allendarlie."¹

This document was shown to Knox by the "good and virtuous" Lady Ormiston. How his wrath gathered as he read in what fashion his name had so been taken in vain any one can easily imagine; but he restrained himself that he might give it suitable vent; and to the lady's

¹ From the document as printed in Miscellany, Bannatyne Club, i. 30 *et seq.*; Bannatyne's Memorials, 12; Calderwood, ii. 515.

anxious inquiry about the truth of the story, he said, "Ye shall know my answer afterwards." "And so the next day," says his secretary, "when he preached, he shew the effect thereof in the pulpit, and declared that the devil, the father of lies, was the chief inventor of that letter, whaever was the penner thereof;" and "the things by them affirmed, and by others believed, are as false as God is true."¹ Another annalist adds that he prophesied from the pulpit "that the contriver should die in a strange land, where he should not have a friend near him to hold up his head;" a prophecy fulfilled on Thomas Maitland, Lethington's brother, who was present, confessed himself the forger, and "departed out of this life in Italy, when he was going to Rome."²

When we find Knox speaking for himself, he sees but one blot in the regent's character—his lenity to his sister. He notes this when addressing the Deity in prayer, lamenting "that foolish pity did so far prevail in him concerning execution and punishment, which Thou commanded to have been executed upon her and upon her accomplices, the murtherers of her husband."³

If those who planned the murder of the regent expected from it a great disorganisation, giving opportunities to desperate men, they were quite correct; and their act was a judicious one according to their political code. Except that of the royal infant, there was no other life in Scotland so well worth taking. The news flew over Europe. To the English Government the event was a heavy blow. In Spain it was received with decorous satisfaction, as one of the steps by which the inscrutable decrees of Providence were to restore the Church. In France it excited wild delight in the party of the Guises. They had a representative nearer home by whom their exultation was shared. It broke in on the monotony of Queen Mary's prison-life with a welcome and joyous excitement, proving, indeed, one of those occasions on which passion overcame her fine sense of decorum and good feeling. In a long letter to

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 14.

² Calderwood, ii. 525; Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 36.

³ Works, vi. 569.

Beaton, the Archbishop of Glasgow, whom she counted her ambassador in France, she states that Bothwellhaugh did not do the deed by her order. Here she might well have stopped, but with a kind of ferocious candour she goes on to say that for that reason she is the more indebted to him for doing it. She expects an intimation that her jointure as Queen-Dowager of France is available ; and in the scheme of distribution she will not forget Bothwellhaugh's pension, which she speaks of as the fulfilment of a promise.¹ It was naturally believed at the time that she knew and authorised the deed, and it was asserted by Randolph that a similar fate would befall the Queen of England if those about her failed in due vigilance.²

It could scarcely be a relief to the difficulties of the

¹ "Ce que Bothwellhach a faict, a esté sans mon commandement, de quoy je luy sçay aussi bon gré et meilleur, que si j'eusse esté du conseil. J'attend les mémoires qui me doivent être envoyez de la recepte de mon douaire pour faire mon estat, ou je n'oubliera la pension du dict Bothwellhaugh."

In this letter she alludes to another person whom it would gratify her to see out of the world. She would be glad if any of her own people did the deed, but still more if it fell to the hangman : "Je voudray qu'une si méchante créature, que le personnage dont il est question, fust hors de la monde, et seroy bien aysé que quelqu'un qui m'appartiens en fust l'instrument, et encore plus qu'il fust pendu de la main d'un bourreau comme il a mérité."—Labanoff, iii. 354. Some have supposed that the unfortunate Admiral Coligny is the person referred to.

An English champion of Queen Mary thus moralises the event along with the tragic death of another of her kinsfolk : "L'auteur de cete enterprise eschappa. Par où apert combien est different le success d'un qui tue un tiran, de celluy qui par trahison meurdrit un bon prince. Car Poltrot le traître qui avoit meurdry le tres illustre Duc de Guise, loyal serviteur de son roy, prenoit telle opportunité qu'il s'eschappoit. Mais en cela reluit toutesfois le jugement admirable de Dieu : car le lendemain apres, il tomba imprudemment es mains de ses ennemis, qui le prindrent et mirent au suplice qu'il avoit merité."—Theatre des cruantez des Heretiques, Antwerp (Anonymous, but by Richard Verstegan, better known as the author of 'The Restoration of Decayed Intelligence'), 1588, p. 92.

² "I must again warn your lordship, that if free liberty be granted to the Scots queen to send and write so oft as she doth, the queen's majesty hath as much need to look unto herself as the regent before he took his death-wound, unto which wicked close I know that that queen was not ignorant, and as willing to have shared of that as she was earnest of the other."—Randolph to Cecil, 12th April 1570; Record Office, MSS., Scot., xvii. 18.

English Government at that time, that both parties in Scotland looked thither for help and a settlement of the political hurricane, which if allowed free scope must shake the nation to pieces. "The king's party" naturally looked to her; indeed, but for her holy horror of subjects undertaking the recasting of their government, she and they were natural allies. The Hamiltons and the queen's party united together in an appeal so remarkable, and so unlike the temper of the times in its signal moderation, that some deep policy must have been hidden beneath it. It begins thus:—

"The present dangerous estate of this our native country, joined with consideration of the future, which threatens to baith the realms fearful accidents (if love of our country move us not on baith the parties by foresight to avoid the peril beforehand), compels us to have recourse to your majesty, as the princess of Christendom who has best means, and as we think of good reason should have the best will, to quench this heat begun amongst us before it burst out into a flame, which is able ere it be long to set both the countries on fire. We confess the first harm is like to be ours, seeing this fire already kindled in our houses; yet is the consequences thereof liable to draw your majesty's estate in fellowship of the same danger, by reason of neighbourhood and other respects, which the situation of the two kingdoms in one isle has made common to both. It is no time for us to hide the burning, whereof the smoke has begun already to discover itself. Neither can we be persuaded that your majesty will refuse us that comfort which by your concurrence will suffice to remove our inconvenient, and consequently your own, whose realm is next neighbour to this. Christian charity will not allow, neither policy permit, that whereas we require water at your hands to repress the rage of the flame, you will bring oil, timber, or other materials to increase and nourish it. For so doing, with our loss of the less, ye should procure the subversion to yourself of the mair."

They represent that the division goes down throughout the community, from the great leaders to the humblest of the people: and that it is not so unequal a division as to

leave the hope that one party may become sufficiently strong to conquer the other and rule the land. It is noted that the reason of the division is obvious: the crown is demanded for two different heads—the mother's and the son's. They call upon the queen to end this division by intervention; but they say expressly that they will not dictate or even suggest the shape in which she is to intervene: "Thus far only we will touch: the foresight of the common danger should induce us on all sides to a common consent to provide the remedy against the same, which in our opinion can be no other but by removing the cause of the division to make the effect to cease—to wit, by reducing the two claims to one, put away the hail fundament of the factions. There is neither prince, potentate, nor people in Christendom has the like interest to desire it, neither yet the like means to perform it. It is profitable for your majesty that strangers have no pretended colour wherefore to enter in this isle, or to set foot on dry land so near your majesty's country. It is honourable to your majesty to set at an accord the two persons which are made the parties, being your next cousins, and most tender to you by blood. It is easy for your majesty to bring it to pass, as well for your credit and authority with all the parties, as that the principal party is at present in your realm." Nor are they more practically explicit when they say: "We trust no faithful counsellor ye have will advise your majesty to enter on the turmoil of a divided state; to bestow your forces, men, or money, in an unnecessary and unprofitable expedient. And unprofitable it will prove in the end if your majesty shall join your fortune with a small portion of this realm, where you may have the hail at your devotion if ye will—to wit, if ye go about to unite us as a flock under the obedience of one head, by entering in conditions with the Queen of Scots whereby the different claims between her highness and her son may cease from henceforth."¹

In the memorials and correspondence of the day the state of Scotland at this terrible juncture recalls the aspect

¹ Written towards the end of March, despatched the 16th of April.
—Record Office, MSS., Scot., xvii. 50.

of an assemblage of persons excited and angry by causes of division, and certain to quarrel, yet not ranged against each other under a distinctly divided policy. The groups form here and there, and the wrath and tendency to quarrel increase. Suddenly there is a crisis. The confusion seems to be deepening, since all appear to be rushing hither and thither. But in reality the criterion which divides the motley assembly into two has been struck ; a vote is to be taken between opposite motions, and all are ranging themselves into order in two opposite groups. The Government of England took the step which sent every Scotsman to his own side, and substituted two fiercely hostile parties for general chaos.

Murray, as we have seen, had got possession of the Earl of Northumberland when he sought refuge in Scotland after the northern rebellion. But there were other refugees, eminent among whom were Nevill, Earl of Westmoreland, and the Lord Dacres. These did not fall into the hands of the Government, but were sheltered by the Border potentates. The Borderers found an excellent opportunity for their old trade ; and a body of them, chiefly Kerrs and Scotts, made a raid into England. The act had significance from some of the English refugees assisting them. The English Government had thus a case against Scotland so strong as to make any question about the legitimacy of the Government there a secondary one. It was an affair in which diplomacy was unnecessary, as it justified immediate action ; for not only were the English rebels harboured in Scotland, but a Scots force in alliance with them had invaded England.

Before making retaliation for this act of war, a State paper was issued by the English Government. It was not in the usual shape of a diplomatic message from one government to another, and there were, no doubt, well-weighed reasons why this could not be. Hence, as it had to be made public, it was impossible to divest it of the offensive form of a proclamation, the shape peculiar to the announcements made by a governing body to those who have to render obedience to it. But the matter of the document was adjusted with wonderful sagacity to counteract the evil

influence of its manner. It is a fine specimen of the skill of Elizabeth's advisers. It was to let the confederates against Queen Mary feel and know that Queen Elizabeth was to strike a blow against Queen Mary's supporters in the cause of those who governed in name of the infant king ; and yet there was not to be one word in justification of those who had risen against the queen—nothing leaving the inference that she was no longer queen, and no admission that Scotland was ruled by a king. Certain of Queen Elizabeth's rebellious subjects having fled to Scotland, "are there not only maintained and kept, but so wickedly, to the dishonour of God, favoured in the countenance of their rebellious enterprises, since their entry into that realm, by the succour of the outlaws, thieves, and disordered rebellious persons living upon the frontiers of Scotland." In company with these the rebels unnaturally invaded their own country, and that "so cruelly with fire and sword as no conjured and mortal enemies could have done more." Then comes the point of delicacy,—those peculiarities in the condition of Scotland which require her to take instead of asking redress. Her majesty finds "that although a great part of the ancient nobility and States of Scotland, who have of long time, like natural good fathers of their native country, nourished peace and concord betwixt both the realms, and at the present seem desirous to conserve the same, their native country, in common peace amongst themselves ; yet they are not able presently, according to justice and the good order of the treaties, speedily to repress and stay the said outlaws and disordered persons upon the Borders from open maintenance of the said English rebels, and from the invasion of England." There are misgivings that the queen's intentions may be misinterpreted : "Her majesty has some doubt that those authors, maintainers, and stirrers of the wicked enterprises, being so manifest against the law of God and nature, will not spare, by their seditious, forged, and colourable engine of craft and malice, to slander and falsely report her majesty's intention at this time in leaving and sending of certain of her forces to her Borders for defence of the same from any further invasion, and there-

with to pursue according to justice her rebellious subjects, and, according to the laws of arms, the invaders of her realm."

She is therefore very earnest that "the simple multitude, which are commonly easily seduced by the craftier, not having pretence of some rule, should not any ways fear evil or harm to follow to the good people of the country or to the public state of that crown by reason of the army of her majesty now to be conducted towards that realm." She appeals to "the wise, noble, and godly," reminding them how ten years ago she drove forth the French, and rescued them from foreign dominion; and how, when her army "being entered into the heart and principal towns, parts, and strengths of that realm, it is manifest to the world that she never sought or coveted any particular interest in that realm for herself, as she easily might."¹ This last is a hint, not too broad, of the right of superiority which it was not wise to fling in the face of Scotland, but yet was ever available as an ultimate justification of English intervention there.

Two English forces—the one under Sussex and Hunsdown, the other under Scrope—crossed the Border, and spread ruin in the old ferocious fashion. Of the achievements of Sussex and his force we have from Sir Robert Constable a specific report, prepared with a parsimony of useless words, and dutiful attention to details, especially the inventorying of the mischief done, such as we have already seen in the reports of like inroads. We are told that Sussex, "from Wark the 17th of April, entered into the realm of Scotland, and did burn and spoil all along the river of Rule and the water of Kale, and encamped that night at Jedburgh. The next morning he marched to Fernyhurst and overthrew it, and so burned and spoiled all along the river of Teviot, and so to Hawick, and burned and spoiled it. The next day he overthrew the strong house of the Laird of Buccleuch, called Branhholm, and thence to Bedrule, a house of Sir Andrew Turnbull, and overthrew it, with divers other notable towers and

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 35.

houses all along those rivers aforementioned. The next night we returned to Jedburgh, where we encamped again. The next morning we dislodged and burnt all the country along the river of Bowmont, and burnt and spoilt the whole country as we marched, and came back that night to Kelso. The number of the towns and villages by estimation was above five hundred, the terror of the which caused the rest of the country to come and offer their submission to my lord-lieutenant, with all the friendship they could do to him and to his; and so we retired ourselves back again for that time, so that we rested ourselves three or four days. The 27th day, my lord-lieutenant being at Wark, accompanied with the whole bands of footmen and a thousand horse, with three battery-pieces and two sacris, went to the siege of Hume, where he planted his battery; where, within twelve hours after the battery was planted, the castle was surrendered to him, simply having within it two hundred and forty soldiers; so the soldiers departed out of it in their hose and doublets.”¹

It may be inferred from this that the terribly-tortured Border district had been accumulating the funds of peaceful industry during the quarter of a century following on the latest desolation from England, since there was so much found by Sussex worth destroying. But there was another consideration more important to the heads of parties in Scotland. What did this invasion mean? Was it to support the new Government in Scotland? or was it meaningless for the time, with a possibility that it might be turned towards the chastisement of those who had dared to rise against an anointed sovereign? So doubtful was all to those chiefly concerned, that in the midst of the work of ruin, Sussex, the chief agent, presses on Cecil the necessity of a decision on what part England is to take in Scotland—where she is to have the friend and where the enemy? He is ready to take either side, according to instruction, but it is clear that he thinks the new Government the safer side for England. “The time

¹ Lodge's Illustrations, i. 508, 509.

passeth away," he says, "and therefore it were good her majesty would resolve what she will do. For as, if she will restore the Scottish queen, it were no good policy to have me show countenance on the other side; so, if she will maintain the other side, and command me to join with them, I will, with allowance of three hundred carriage-horses, make all men within thirty miles of the Borders to obey that authority, or I will not leave a stone house for any of them to sleep in in surety that shall refuse. And if her majesty command me to pass further, I will, with the help of Morton, deliver the Castle of Edinburgh, or any other in Scotland, to any in Scotland whom Morton, with her majesty's consent, shall appoint to receive them. These matters have too long slept. It is time now to wake, and therefore, good Mr Secretary, sound the queen's mind fully; and if she intend to restore the Scotch queen, advise her to do it in convenient sort, and suffer me not to put my finger in the fire without cause, and her to be drawn into it by such degrees as are neither honourable nor sure; and if she will set up the other side, and make open show thereof, let her command what she will, and it shall be done, or I will lie by it."¹

There was no distinct utterance as to the ultimate policy of the invasion, but inferences might be made by noticing those who were attacked and those who were spared. It seemed as yet that the object of the invaders was merely the punishment of those Border tribes, chiefly of the Kerrs and Scotts, who had invaded England. But penetrating northward as far as the Forth and the Clyde, there was a deeper policy in the aim of the invasion. The Hamiltons and the queen's party were the sufferers. The Palace or Castle of Hamilton was stripped and battered, and the estates of the family in East Lothian were swept and plundered. Thus an opportunity came for aiding the new Government, without acknowledging the acts of those who had committed political sacrilege by uplifting the hand against their anointed queen. That this party was

¹ Lodge's Illustrations, i. 506.

favoured was to be inferred only from the punishment inflicted on its enemies.

Such was the Queen of England's answer to the appeal made to her friendship and magnanimity by the supporters of her good sister. But it had the full effect of a Fabian policy, and served their turn better than foreign assistance. Those who were dubious before now saw where their enemy was—their “auld enemy” of England. There were men still able to carry a pike who had fought in the last war of extermination with the invader. Men yet in the prime of life remembered when the Scots bought English captives from the French for the sheer satisfaction of putting them to death. Hitherto the queen's party had consisted of leaders without followers. It was said that among her supporters there were eighteen standing in precedence as nobles of the realm higher than the highest of the king's party. The strength of the king's party lay in the popular feeling, which had taken the shape of aversion to the queen. But there was another and a deeper-seated fountain of national feeling in hatred of England. The political conditions of the time enrolled those who felt this passion as supporters of Queen Mary; and thus, as it has appeared to some, a large body of the Scots people had suddenly repented of their disloyalty and returned to their duty.

To counteract the spirit thus created there was the influence of the Reformation. In some measure this was an influence partaking of religious sincerity. But there were selfish interests allied to it. The institutions of the country and a great part of the national wealth were identified with the existence of the new Church, and the restoration of the queen would render imminent the risk of a counter-revolution, in which personal interests would be deeply injured. Now for the first time was Scotland divided into the elements that make a true civil war. Of old there had been contests between the Saxon and the Celt. The English Saxon, when he was made the instrument of Norman aggression, was beaten back by his brother Saxon of Scotland. Aggrandising families like the Douglasses wrought confusion and bloodshed for a

time, and there were many secondary causes of contention. Now, however, for the first time, the people of Scotland were divided, and that nearly equally, between two allegiances; and all who knew the nature of that people must have been prepared for a domestic war of extermination.

The troubled waters were now at hand in which it delighted such a politician as Lethington to angle. When the English general taunted him as to his doubtful conduct, it was with something like a jeer that he said of that general's army, "They have reasonably well acquitted themselves of the duty of old enemies, and have burned and spoiled as much ground within Scotland as any army of England did in one year these hundred years bypast, which may suffice for a two months' work, although you do no more."¹

The change in the political conditions found the duke, Lethington, and some others, inmates of the Castle of Edinburgh. It now served them for protection, as indeed it had Lethington from the beginning. He resumed his old office as Secretary of State, but now he was acting as secretary to the queen. He was nominally under accusation of treason and murder. The law even then afforded accused persons the means of relief from the continued suspension of a criminal charge over their heads by empowering them to force it to an issue. Lethington thus passed through the form of a trial. A verdict of acquittal, a "cleansing by assize," as it was termed, was a useful possession to almost any Scots statesman of that day. Hence, as in the memorable instance of Bothwell, we sometimes find that when a man is at the summit of his power he is clamorous to be put on trial for some grave crime.

Beside him was another person who was to be sadly conspicuous in the shiftings of the tragic drama—Kirkcaldy of Grange, the captain or governor of the Castle of Edinburgh. The commanders of the four great strongholds, Edinburgh, Stirling, Dunbar, and Dumbarton, were each a separate power in the State, and his appointment

¹ Quoted, P. F. Tytler.

was a serious affair of policy. When with much difficulty the dubious Balfour was removed from the command, the choice of his successor seemed peculiarly happy. He was the first, through dangers and difficulties, to court the English alliance as the means of safety from the ambitious projects of France. He was one of the few laymen who had more than a self-interested attachment to the Reformed Church. He had been an enemy of the queen's cause—not ferocious or cruel, for these defects were not in his nature, but not therefore the less thorough and stanch. Had he been intrusted with his charge by the queen's party, and then held it for the enemy, there would have been no scruple in heaping terms of infamy upon his memory; but as it was to Queen Mary that he handed over the charge intrusted to him by the new Government, the transaction tended to increase his fame as a loyal and chivalrous soldier. Murray, as we have seen, doubted him. He was now the enemy of the king's party, and the manner in which he announced his new position was emphatic and picturesque. Morton was by force of circumstances the leader of the king's party. As he was riding with a train of followers along the fields under the castle rock, a gun was fired, and a ball came bounding into the cavalcade. This was Grange's announcement that Morton and he were enemies.

It remains that the king's party should have a new head to succeed to the murdered regent. Here the selection and its method tended to complete the splitting of Scotland into two parties. The Earl of Lennox was the man. He was appointed in the mean time Lieutenant-Governor of Scotland, that the business of the Government might not be interrupted while the question of his advancement to the regency was deliberately considered. It will be remembered that he married the daughter of Henry VIII.'s sister, and that he was the father of Darnley. He was now an old man. He abode, and might have continued to abide, in peaceful affluence on his English estate of Temple Newsome. It might have been forgotten, had not his return to political life reminded his countrymen, that when he was some thirty years younger he was

punished for what his countrymen counted an attempt to sell them to King Henry.¹ He was, as we have seen, claimed as a subject by Queen Elizabeth. He was much in her confidence, and virtually he was sent by her to rule Scotland in her interest. The method of the transaction gave the other party a fair ground for putting it in this form; for although he was chosen by the heads of the king's party at a meeting where they counted themselves to be the Estates of the realm, yet they put themselves into diplomatic communication with Queen Elizabeth, and it was by her sanction and permission that he accepted of the proffered office.

The form of the intervention was as important as the act itself. At a meeting at Stirling, the heads of the king's party, at which Lennox was present, sent to Queen Elizabeth a despatch requesting her advice on the question whom they should choose as regent. She said she was glad to help them, but loath to dictate. She would rather that they selected and she approved. In the mean time, however, she will not hide her opinion from them. If their choice should alight on the Earl of Lennox, their king's grandfather, she thinks "none can be chosen in that whole realm that shall more desire the preservation of the king, and be more made to have the government for his safety, being next to him in blood of any noblemen of that realm or elsewhere."

If the king's party thus courted the stigma of acting under English dictation, they gained some equivalent in at length extracting from the Queen of England an acknowledgment of their new Government. Her despatch, dated on the 2d of July, was in this respect totally different in purport from the other just referred to, dated in April. The Scots had urged it upon her that "great inconvenients" had come of the lack on her part of any "resolute answer concerning the establishment of the regimen of the realm under their young king." She was now, however, to be "resolute" in her undertaking. She accepts the political situation in the shape in which it is

¹ See above, chap. xxxiv.

put. Scotland has a king ; but he is a child, and another must in the mean time rule for him. There are a few words, to keep up consistency with her championship of Queen Mary. She has promised to hear what that queen has to say for herself, and will yet hear her, both for her own sake and the welfare of her realm. Then follows : “ Yet not knowing what the same may be that shall so be offered, we mean not to break the order of law and justice by advancing her cause, or prejudging her contrary, before we shall deliberate and assuredly see, upon the hearing of the whole, some plain, necessary, and just cause so to do.”

That there was no chance of her finding “ just cause ” for advancing the claims of Queen Mary, the king’s party might be well assured in what follows : “ And therefore finding that realm ruled by a king, and the same affirmed by laws of that realm, and therefore invested by coronation and other solemnities used and requisite, and generally so received by the whole Estates ;—we mean not by yielding to hear the complaints or informations of the queen against her son, to do any act whereby to make conclusion of governments, but, as we have found it, to suffer the same to continue ; yea, not to suffer it to be altered by any means that we may impesch, as to our honour it doth belong, and as by our late actions hath manifestly appeared, until by some justice and clear cause we shall be directly induced otherwise to declare our opinion ; and this we would have them to know to be our determination and courtesy that we mean to hold, wherein we trust they for their king may see how plainly and honourably we mean to proceed, and how little cause they have to doubt of us, whatever to the contrary they hear or shall hear.”¹

Hereafter we find the dictatorial feature somewhat strengthened in Queen Elizabeth’s dealing with Scotland as if she addressed rather her own subordinates than the rulers of a sovereign state. She issued a request equivalent to a demand to abstain from war until she should settle the affairs of Scotland, and was angry when her

¹ Bannatyne’s Memorials, 46.

wishes were disregarded. It was to be war as well as peace just as she chose ; for when the new regent recrossed the Border, it was as joint-leader with Sir William Drury of a part of the English army that had invaded Scotland.¹

To the Hamiltons the selection of Lennox as Governor of Scotland was a special blow. It pointed in the direction of the Lennox family being the next heirs of the crown. That he was the grandfather of the king was of course his chief qualification for the office. By the law of private rights the nearest relation on the male side, who would be the heir or the heir's parent, took the management of the estate. Thus had Arran acted as governor in Queen Mary's minority, and now, as the duke, he was, so far as her nomination sufficed, her regent or lieutenant over Scotland while she was under incapacity as a prisoner abroad. But the king's regent or lieutenant was his own nearest relation by the father's side. If the opportunity came for the house of Lennox pressing a claim for the succession to the crown, this appointment to the regency would of course strengthen their hands for a contest.

To the extent of one successful blow the new regency began auspiciously. The centre of support to Queen Mary's party was Dumbarton Castle. How available it was for immediate communication with France, was shown when she, an infant, was snatched from the grasp of Henry VIII., and sent to be reared at the French Court. Since the change of government it had been the means of constant intercourse with the Continent, whence it was supplied with arms and provisions. Such portions of Queen Mary's French dowry as she could realise in that period of trouble to France as well as other countries was chiefly employed within the stronghold on which so much of her hope for the future rested. At a moment of difficulty we find her obtaining a loan of a thousand crowns from the renowned Spanish general Alva, chiefly for this purpose.

The cleft rock on which this fortress stood is too well known to need description. To keep up its name as a **fort**, a few buildings of late date, forming a sort of barrack,

¹ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 176.

still stand in the cleft and the slope at the foot of the rock. Of old the fortifications, occupying accessible ledges on the way up, culminated to the top of the rock, as at Edinburgh and Stirling; while its height, and its isolation from other eminences, were the reasons, under the old ideas of fortification, for selecting it as the site for one of the chief national strongholds.

The place appears to have been hitherto unmolested, and there was no indication of preparation for a siege. This was all the more propitious for the project on hand, since it is scarcely possible to support ceaseless vigilance in a small body of men who day after day and month after month find themselves let alone. It was resolved to make a sudden dash at the place and take it by assault, the shape in which it was most usual for Scots fortresses to change hands. The service was intrusted to the regent's kinsman, Thomas Craufurd of Jordanhill. We have twice crossed this man in the course of our story. It was he who kept the significant note of what passed between Queen Mary and her sick husband in Glasgow, and it was he who accused Lethington as one of the murderers of Darnley. Thus, for all he had hitherto done, his name might have been merely found in the obscure byways of history as belonging to something like a spy and informer. But his opportunity had now come, and he was to be remembered as the hero of one of the most daring and successful achievements in the warfare of his day.¹

¹ Craufurd, though we do not at any earlier period cross him as a conspicuous figure in the wars of the times, was an old experienced soldier. He was taken captive at Pinkie Cleuch in 1547. He died in 1594, and was buried in the churchyard of Kilbirnie, in Ayrshire, where this inscription will be found on a monument to his memory: "God schaw the right. Heir lyis Thomas Craufurd of Jordanhil, sext son to Laurence Craufurd of Kilbirny, and Jonet Ker, his spous, eldest dochter to Robert Ker of Kerrisland." The monument itself is peculiar and attractive. There is a recumbent statue of the warrior himself in armour, and of his wife, side by side, after the old Gothic fashion, which was becoming obsolete. The figures lie within a quadrangular piece of stonework like a sarcophagus, and they are seen through slits which admit a dim light, giving the statues a mysterious funereal tone. The church of Kilbirnie, though outside it is

The truce expired with the month of March, and on the 1st of April the regent and Craufurd adjusted the project in Glasgow. The first step was to send on small parties to hold the ways between Glasgow and Dumbarton, so that no intimation of the design might reach the garrison. The drum was then "struck" in the streets of Glasgow, and a hundred men were picked out of those who agreed to serve on the expedition.

The leader had the assistance of a guide who had once served as a sentinel in the castle, "who knew all the crags, where it was best to climb, and where fewest ladders would serve." The party marched in silence, so as to reach the spot when the moon disappeared about one o'clock. They occupied an hour in preparation, and then they had little more than three hours for their work before sunrise. Meanwhile a fog helped the darkness. Their siege-apparatus consisted of ladders with "craws" or clamps of iron to catch the angles of the trap-rock. Their plan of operation was that, each man having his hackbut or musket slung on his back, all were to move in single file, the guide leading, followed by Craufurd. A rope passed along the whole line. It strung them together, so that without light each man had the means of keeping his place in the line. For the first part of the ascent they had to use the ladders. There were several discouraging casualties at this point, one of which, as told by Buchanan, and by him only among contemporaries, gives much picturesqueness to the feat. One of the men was seized with a fit of epilepsy. He held to the ladder with a convulsive grasp, completely blocking the way. The leader ordered him to be tied to the ladder; it was then turned round, and the passage was once more free.

The top of the ladder was still some twenty feet from the first ledge or terrace. Craufurd, who seems to have been an expert cragsman, scrambled up to it along with

plain and inexpressive, like the churches built in Scotland after the Reformation, has beauties inside worth examining. Chief among these is a gallery which belonged to the Craufurd family. It has some rich carved woodwork of the Renaissance period, a thing very rarely to be found in the churches of Scotland.

the guide. Apt to their purpose a small tree grew on the ledge; to this they fixed ropes, dropping them for the assistance of the others. They were still fourscore fathoms from the wall. Up to this distance Craufurd and the guide again scrambled, letting down ropes to the others. It was not till they began mounting the wall and descending within that a sentinel saw them and roused the garrison. This part of the works seems to have been left unguarded, in reliance on its natural inaccessibility. Once gained, it was the most available part of all the fortress for those who had it. It was in itself, in fact, a separate fortress overlooking that of the garrison. The assailants turned the cannon upon the lower processes of the fortress, and that, not as a besieger's artillery would play, on the face of the walls and ramparts, but on the open sloping space behind them, before which they were raised to give protection against enemies from below, not from above. Thus the garrison were utterly helpless.¹ Fleming the governor escaped by a boat, leaving his wife, who, by the admission of all parties, was courteously treated by the victors. Of the few casualties, all fell to the garrison. Some of them got over the wall, and a few were taken.

The king's party had some other successful affairs, one especially at Brechin and another at Paisley; but the

¹ No one seems to have attempted to identify the precise track of the escaladers, and indeed one might wander about the rock and fix on point after point as complying with all the conditions of the narrative. If bound to fix the point of ascent, I would put it at the south side of the more westerly of the two heights, and thus a little to the left of the present entrance to the fortress. This leads to the higher of the two tops, and when this is reached the command over the others appears complete; and it is seen how cannon pointed from it would within an easy range cover an enemy placed on a sloping bank above the protection of ramparts or walls intended to protect them from assault from the cleft in the rock and other parts below, but not built in anticipation of a cannonade from the higher summit. The rock, though it has an appearance very hopeless to the climber both at a distance and close by, is not unsuitable for escalade. It is a clean crystalline black trap, too hard either to be scarped by the defenders or notched by the assailants. But from its crystalline character it would present steps and angular points which might be thoroughly trusted to hold against any pressure.

2 taking of Dumbarton was the crowning triumph, to which these were mere auxiliaries. There was no longer a place of absolute refuge for the queen's party—a door of communication with their friends abroad, and a secure entrance into Scotland for a foreign force.

Among the merciful precepts which philosophers have endeavoured to teach to statesmen and warriors, one is, that in war all great blows should be directed against some centre of the enemy's power, where his capacity for hostility may be paralysed with the smallest cost in human life and misery. It would be difficult to find an achievement so thoroughly fulfilling this condition as the taking of Dumbarton Castle. More than any other event it is entitled to the credit of turning the balance between King James and Queen Mary, which means the balance between the English and the French alliance. The acquisition cost only four human lives. The assailants lost none: four of the garrison were killed; and a local historian thinks it right to add that their death was "more by accident than design." On the day of the capture the regent triumphantly dined in the castle on the good cheer supplied for the garrison by the French. Much valuable spoil was obtained; but the most precious of all the acquisitions made by the victors was John Hamilton, the Archbishop of St Andrews, who was found with his harness on ready to fight. He was conveyed in custody to Stirling Castle. It will be observed that the 2d of April was the day of his seizure; on the 7th, at two o'clock in the afternoon, he was hanged on the common gibbet in the market-place of Stirling. There is no record of his trial and condemnation, but it is generally stated by contemporary writers that there was the form of a trial. It went on three charges of crime in which he was principal or accessory—the murder of Darnley, a conspiracy against the young prince, and the murder of the Regent Murray. Even in the mere form of a trial there was a touch of scrupulosity; for Hamilton, as we have seen, had been "forefaulted" or outlawed in Parliament. A wolf's head, as it used to be metaphorically said, was put upon his shoulders, and he was placed beyond the protection of

the law. Taken, too, as he was, in an enemy's fortress which he was accoutred to defend, it would have been but a slight addition to the violences of the age had he been killed on the spot.

Yet, although the form of law was given to his death, it was an act of vengeance rather than of justice. This was shown in the humiliating shape in which the tragedy was completed, as well as in other little incidents. Among these was the placing on the gibbet a couple of lines endowed with an epigrammatic terseness worthy of a better spirit.¹ Of course both the religious and the moral codes of the present day forbid any justification of such an act done in such a spirit. Yet the death of Hamilton was a natural event, not to be lifted to the level of those great outrages which made Europe hold its breath as at astounding examples of crime, such as the three great murders which had just made Scotland a byword. Hamilton had been long devoutly detested by the bulk of his countrymen. It was remembered throughout all the Protestant community that the latest persecutions, even unto death, for the Church of Rome, were especially his doing. He was the suggester and director of the policy of the Hamiltons, and in later times the special shape of their policy had been murder. He was believed to have instigated the tragedy of the Kirk-of-Field. His had been the head that planned the death of the regent, though the deed had been committed to the hand of another Hamilton. There was at that time a John Hamilton, a secular priest, understood to be a trusted agent of Alva, and deep in his bloody secrets. He was called the "Skirmisher," and whatever suspicions there might be about the nature of his acts were confirmed by a crime that made his name ring over Europe—the murder of the great French civilian Barnabé Brissot.² It was noted among the signs of

¹ "Cresce diu felix arbor, semperque vireto
Frondebibus, ut nobis talia poma feras."

² We may have to treat of this man elsewhere as one of the literary ornaments of the old Church. His practical life, so much of it as came above ground, belongs less to Scotland than to France, where, under the name of the Curé de St Cosme, his feats are among the

Grange's apostasy, that in Edinburgh, where he was all-powerful, he tolerated "a set of the strongest throat-cutters of the Hamiltons going plainly upon the Edinburgh causey."¹ Without the archbishop this mischievous gang would be powerless. The head of the house, as we have seen, was a byword for infirmity of purpose, and neither of his sons had capacity for affairs.

The queen's party determined in their turn to strike a great blow. Their project, had it entirely succeeded, would have been more than substantial retribution for the seizure of Dumbarton; but it ended in nothing but empty revenge for the death of Hamilton. An attempt had been made in May by "the king's party" to hold a meeting of the Estates in Edinburgh. They assembled in a part of the city outside the wall; but they found even this place too hot for them, and retired without transacting business. They adjourned to Stirling, where a solemn Parliament was held. Thus were brought into one group all that was valuable to the new cause—the territorial aristocracy and other leading men, the regent, and the infant king himself. This was the first solemn assemblage of the

wildest in the history of the League. One of the biographies written by Lord Hailes is the 'Life of John Hamilton, a Secular Priest.' The able author of this sketch was dry almost to affectation, but all his art could not divest so wild and varied a life of a certain picturesqueness when all of it was accurately told. His connection with Alva is thus noted by John Knox's secretary: "In this mean time there came from Flanders a little pink, and in it two gentlemen, with Mr John Hamilton, called the 'Skirmisher,' fra Duke d' Alva. The heads of their commission are not yet notified," &c.—Bannatyne's Memorials, 51. Froude, in his foreign researches, had come across the track of this John Hamilton, when, in reference to Bothwellhaugh, he says: "Assassination was an accomplishment in his family. John Hamilton, a notorious desperado, who was his brother or near relative, had been employed in France to murder Coligny, and, singularly enough, at that very moment Philip II., who valued such services, had his eye upon him as a person who might be sent to look after, as Philip pleasantly put it, the Prince of Orange. The cavalier would have taken with the utmost kindness to the occupation, but his reputation for such atrocities was so notorious that Philip was obliged to choose some one against whom the prince would be less likely to be upon his guard."—ix. 577.

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 128.

Estates since the critical Parliament of 1567. There had been casual meetings chiefly for forfeitures, but no transaction of legislative business. This Parliament opened on the 28th of August 1571. It was inaugurated by two incidents afterwards deemed ominous. John Row, one of the most zealous of Knox's followers, having to preach before the assemblage, took advantage of his opportunity, and "in plain pulpit pronounced to the lords for their covetousness, and because they would not grant the just petitions of the Kirk, God's hasty vengeance to fall upon them."¹ The other prognostic was of a more pleasant kind. The infant king was its hero, and it individualised him among his people as they heard it. The story is best told in the words of a contemporary: "The king being conveyed to the Parliament House, and set at the board, by fortune he espied a hole in the board-cloth; so that, as young childer are always unconstant and restless, he pressed to attain to the hole with his finger, and asked of a lord wha sat near by him to know what house that was? and he answered that it was the 'Parliament House.' Then said the king, 'This Parliament has a hole in it.' Quhether God inspired the babe with prophecy at that time or not I will not dispute, but in very deed the chief leader of that Parliament was stopped with sick a hole within five days after this saying that was the very cause of his death."²

On the 3d of September a force left Edinburgh on an expedition. It consisted of three hundred horsemen and eighty hackbutters or musketeers, who were mounted behind so many horsemen. Nominally it was commanded by Huntly, the queen's lieutenant, but the guide and real commander was named Bell. The leaders kept their counsel well, and gave currency to a report that they were to assail the town of Jedburgh. Nothing could be more natural, for that community had sorely insulted the queen's party. A pursuivant had been sent from the castle to proclaim the queen's authority in Jedburgh; but the magis-

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 185.

² Historie of James the Sext, 88.

trates and burghers not only compelled him to swallow his parchment writ, but untrussed his points and assailed him with leather straps after the manner of the dorsal discipline administered to schoolboys.¹

The force that seemed naturally despatched to avenge this insult, leaving Edinburgh in the direction of the Border, was suddenly wheeled westward, and reached Stirling between three and four o'clock on the morning of the 4th. The king appears to have been within the castle; but the regent and the other members of the Estates were quartered in the town, which, for all that it contained so precious a treasure, seems to have been unguarded. The assailants were able to sweep the streets with cries for the queen and vengeance for the fate of the archbishop. They battered in the doors of the houses occupied by the regent and Morton, and took them both, dragging them, with several other prisoners, towards the Nether Port or outer gate. The assailants would have got clear off with their spoil but for the character of their troops. These being Borderers, could not resist sacking the sleeping city, and were busy stripping the booths and emptying the stables of the valuable stock of horses belonging to the Court and the members of the Estates. Some time, too, had been lost in the attack on Morton's house, which was too strong to be easily entered. The garrison of the castle had thus time to act. The governor, Mar, planted a party in the unfinished building still called Mar's Work, and marched another on the enemy. They were joined by some of the burghers, and the assailants had now to abandon their prisoners and take to flight. Ere this was done, however, one of them, James Calder, fired at the regent, and hit him mortally in the lower party of the body. Spence of Wormiston, one of the assailing party who attended on the regent to protect him, was killed by a bullet; and in the confusion it was not known whether it was aimed by one of his own people at the regent, or was dealt by the other party. The wounded regent lamented the death of his protector, of whom a chronicler not given to eloquence

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 177.

says, "He was in all his life sa gentle, sa humane, sa kind, sa handy, and sa prosperous and happy in all his wars, that his like easily could not heretofore be founden."¹

The Laird of Buccleuch had taken special charge of Morton for the like worthy purpose of protecting him from the Borderers. "I will save your life as you saved mine," said Morton, when the tide turned so that the captive became custodier. The assailants had taken many lives during their brief command of the streets, and now they were chased, with much slaughter, as far as the village of St Ninians.

The wounded regent lingered in life some hours. Like many fulfilments of prophecies, his fate was scarcely a logical consummation of Durie's denunciation; for we are told that "at this Parliament, because the petitions of the Kirk were contemned, and the ministers called proud knaves, with other injurious words, by the lords for sub-taking of their liberty, yet the poor regent approved their petitions, and acknowledged them to be most reasonable, and was willing to further the same; but the lords, Morton especially, who ruled all, said he should lay their pride, and put order to them, with many other injurious words."² Some sentences were recorded as dropping from the lips of the dying regent; they were in general, after the usual manner, praying for the prosperity of his country and his cause, but the last were about his "poor wife Meg." She, it will be remembered, was the daughter of Angus and Henry VIII.'s sister. Some thirty years earlier, the love which Lennox and the high-born maiden bore to each other was an element of purity and gentleness in a household credited with dark political intrigues. In the after-life, which was so closely mixed with the horrible story of their son's career, this light still burned, and it brightened the last scene of all.³

¹ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 249.

² *Bannatyne's Memorials*, 186.

³ Some traces of the love-story of Lennox and Margaret Douglas enliven those State papers of the year 1544 which exhibit the designs of Henry VIII. against Scotland. On the 8th of March Hertford

intimates to Henry that Thomas Bishop, Lennox's secretary, "re-paireth purposely to the Court for to see the Lady Margaret, with whom he saith the said earl is so far in love that if it so please your majesty that matter is like to take effect." Henry, less after the fashion of a Bluebeard than of the beneficent bachelor uncle who blesses the happy pair on the stage, likes the general aspect of the alliance, and "would be contented that the said marriage do take effect between him and our said niece;" but he must first see how they like each other, "forasmuch as we have promised unto our niece never to cause her to marry any but whom she shall find in her own heart to love."—Leman's State Papers, iv. 363, 365. Mr Froude has formed the opinion—and it seems to be well supported—that Meg was a very politic person: "She had tried to persuade Mary Tudor to execute Elizabeth, that the crown might fall to herself. She had contrived Darnley's marriage with the Queen of Scots to unite their titles, and had worked hard to organise the Catholic party for a rising in England in their favour."—xi. 72. This view accounts for a letter by Queen Mary on which the more enthusiastic of the Vindicators have expended much gratulation. It was written to Beaton, and professes to be a revocation of the charge of murdering her son maintained by her against Queen Mary. It bears date 2d May 1578, a time when there was a strong belief that Mary would soon be queen both of England and Scotland. "This acknowledgment," says Mr Froude, "which was of extreme value at the time to the Queen of Scots in assisting her to clear her reputation, has been relied upon in later times as evidence in her favour. It is worth while to observe, therefore, that Lady Lennox continued long after to speak in her old language to others. Elizabeth, suspecting the reconciliation, questioned her about it. 'I asked her majesty if she could think so,' Lady Lennox wrote to Burghley; 'for I was made of flesh and blood, and could never forget the murder of my child; and she said, Nay, by her faith, she could not think that ever I could forget it, for if I would I were a devil.'"—xi. 72.

CHAPTER LIV.

THE REGENCY.

(Continued.)

MAR SUCCEEDING LENNOX—THE WAR CONTINUED IN EDINBURGH—KIRKCALDY OF GRANGE AND HIS ESCAPADES—HIS QUARREL WITH KNOX—KNOX AND OTHERS ON PRAYING FOR THE QUEEN—KNOX'S DANGER—FINAL DISCUSSION IN THE CASTLE BETWEEN KNOX ON THE ONE HAND AND GRANGE AND LETHINGTON ON THE OTHER—THE POLICY OF LETHINGTON—HIS APPEAL TO FRANCE—THE ACCOMPANYING REVELATIONS ABOUT THE DANGER OF THE QUEEN'S CAUSE—THE NATURE OF THE CONTEST—THE GORDONS IN THE NORTH—THE BATTLE OF THE CRAIBSTONE—THE BURNING OF THE HOUSE OF TOWIE—READJUSTMENT OF THE CHURCH—TULCHAN BISHOPS—KNOX'S DEPARTURE FROM EDINBURGH—HIS POSITION WITH THE BRETHREN—HIS RETURN AND DEATH—DEATH OF THE REGENT MAR.

As yet the Parliament had transacted no business, and their first step was to choose a regent, since, as the minutes of their proceedings bear, "one is more convenient to govern and rule in the king's majesty's minority than more." The election, made on the 5th, the day after the regent's death, was effected in a shape thoroughly deliberative and constitutional. The Estates in the first place passed a resolution to acknowledge and obey the person who might be chosen by the majority. A leet was made of the names of three earls—Argyle, Morton, and Mar. The last was then chosen by the majority of the votes of those present. Before taking the oath of office, he protested, and probably with a sincerity seldom accorded to those who profess reluctance to ascend into

high places, that the office was none of his seeking. "Albeit," he said, "it has pleased you by common voice and assent to accord that I shall be placed in the charge of regiment to the king's majesty, his realm and lieges, during his highness's minority; whilk place, I avow before God, and the world, I was never ambitious of, neither can it be beneficial to me nor any of mine in any respect, considering the present troubled state of the realm, and the hard reward that such as have preceded in that office has received."¹

It will now be proper to look a few months backwards, that we may follow consecutively the track of events tending to concentrate the struggle in Edinburgh. There the possession of the castle was a power capable of enlarging itself. Repeated sallies were made into the streets. It was deemed a conclusive act of hostility to the existing Government when a party from the garrison seized the Tolbooth, containing the Parliament House, the courts of law, and the prison, in the manner to be presently told. At last Grange was master of the town as well as the castle. He played at this time some pranks of captious eccentricity, as if he were seeking quarrels—a pursuit not unusual with those who are ill at ease from changing sides, and feel as if it would be comfortable rather to be driven into a hostile position by enemies than to take it up against friends. In June he issued a sort of cartel of general defiance to all those who, as he says, had "given out to the people false and untrue tales of me, calling me ane traitor and murtherer, and assister of murtherers, and especially allowder of the slaughter of the Earl of Murray, late regent of good memory, to whom it is notour what good affection I bore, and for whom during his life I hazarded all that I had in the world, and divers times my person, in places where the authors of such calumnies durst not to have shown their faces." He concludes in the usual phraseology of the duello—to whomsoever he be that participates in such charges, he will be told that he "lies in his throat." Alexander Stewart, son of the Lord Garlies, took up the

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 65.

challenge; but instead of leading to a passage at arms, the affair took the shape that would have been the last thing chosen by the heroic Grange when in his right condition—the shape of a long, bitter, and foul correspondence.¹ Another of his quarrels was still less glorious; but it had considerable results, and is curious as showing the antiquity of a practice better known a century later. It consisted in administering personal chastisement to an opponent through hirelings, and treating him as a person so base that there was no disgrace in refusing him personal satisfaction by the duello for the injuries inflicted on him.

John Kirkcaldy, a cousin of Grange, had gone to Dunfermline, in Fifeshire, to act as an assizer or jurymen. He there met with some of the family of Durie and their followers. There was a squabble, in which Kirkcaldy received a blow in the face from a fist. The magistrates of Dunfermline interposed, and prevented bloodshed. These Duries were the neighbours and hereditary enemies of the Kirkcaldies. Grange says of them, in a spirit which he seems to have thought forgiving: "It is notoriously known" that they "have done to me and mine many great offences, grievous injuries, and exorbitant displeasures—the principal of that house being the chief author of the death and destruction of my grandsire, the Laird of Raith, with the ruin of his house. And sinsyne have they not daily and continually molested and troubled us, his posterity and friends, in our righteous titles, native realms, and auld possessions? and yet, praised be God, we never made us to take revenge thereof by way of deid or bloodshed, but patiently have suffered and sustained the same as Christians."² One of those concerned in the squabble afterwards appeared in the streets of Edinburgh, where, as Grange says, he "most disdainfully passeth up and down the town, and most proudly crossed my servants' gates with such jesting and mocking means and countenance as would have irritate and commoved the most patient flesh living." The poor fellow paid heavily for his

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 141 *et seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 74.

bravado. Grange sent half-a-dozen varlets to chastise him with the cudgel. They found him just embarking at Leith. Instead of patiently enduring his chastisement, he resisted—swords were drawn, and he was left dead. In the attempt to escape, one of the assailants was seized and committed to the Tolbooth. Grange determined to attack this building and release his man. He secured the great bell of St Giles's, the tocsin used for assembling the citizens in time of trouble. A party then attacked the building; it was strong, and stood a short siege, but an entry was forced ere morning. The prisoner was taken to the castle along with another, about whom there was a mystery—a woman. She was said to be connected with the Hamiltons, and under charge of accession to the murder of the Regent Murray. All Edinburgh was that night roused and excited by the thundering of the castle artillery. What occasion there was for this no one could make out, and it was set down as a mere act of wanton mischief, intended to frighten and insult the citizens.

These affairs happened before the taking of Dumbarton, during the truce accepted at the desire of Queen Elizabeth. Kirkcaldy would not admit that they were acts of war; they did not reach that dignity, being the mere chastisement of insolent citizens. Cecil wrote a letter to Grange, denouncing in strong terms his general conduct and this special act; but a scolding from such a quarter tended to serve his turn by imparting to his conduct the complexion of a quarrel with England.

The outrage in the city created another quarrel nearer home, and Grange cannot stand quite clear of the charge that he fostered this quarrel to serve his purpose. It was desirable that Knox and he should come to issue as enemies. It was never a very difficult task to get Knox into that position, and here he gave the opportunity promptly by censuring Grange from the pulpit on the forenoon of the ensuing Sunday. As Craig preached in the afternoon, a paper was put into his hands. It was from Grange, and in these words:—

“This day John Knox in his sermon openly called me a murderer and a throat-cutter; wherein he has spoken

further than he is able to justify, for I take God to be my damnation if it was my mind that that man's blood should have been shed whereof he has called me the murderer. And the same God I desire from the bottom of my heart to pour out His vengeance suddenly upon him or me, whether of us twa has been most desirous of innocent blood. This I desire you in God's name to declare openly to the people."¹

Craig did not comply with this request, referring him who tendered it to the judicatories of the Church, of which Grange still professed to be a member. There Knox denied that he had used such words. He had spoken more in sorrow than in anger. He had said, to be sure, that "in his days he never saw so slanderous, so malapert, so fearful and tyrannous a fact." But what made him feel it thus was his old esteem for the doer of it: "If the committer had been a man without God, a throat-cutter, and sic ane as had never known the works of God, it had moved me no more than other riots and enormities that my eyes have seen the prince of this world—Satan, by his instruments, wicked men—raise up against Jesus Christ now preached; but to see stars fall from heaven, and a man of knowledge to commit so manifest treason,—what godly heart cannot but lament, tremble, and fear? God be merciful, for the example is terrible, and we have all need earnestly to call to God 'Lead us not into temptation,' and especially to deliver us from the company of the wicked; for within these few years men would have looked for other fruits of that man than now have budded forth."²

It was supposed that Grange was in some measure satisfied. He heard, however, that Knox continued to preach against him, and he resolved to meet his enemy on his own ground. It was upwards of a year since he had attended the church services; but he went again once for all, professedly out of respect to the widow of the late regent, who was going to hear Knox preach. Grange took with him a strong armed escort, consisting, as it was

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 72.

² Ibid., 76.

remarked, of those who had been the most conspicuous in the recent outrages. Knox, as his secretary tells us, preached on that occasion sharply "against all such as forgot God's benefits received; and entreating of God's great mercies bestowed upon penitent sinners, according to his common manner, he forewarned proud contemners that God's mercy appertained not to such as with knowledge proudly transgressed, and after more proudly maintained the same."¹

Grange spoke his anger to those around him, and so loudly, it was said, as to be virtually addressing the congregation. Knox was in the mean time in a state of transition into another quarrel, with a deeper root in the political conditions of the time. Grange's garrison being master of Edinburgh, would have the clergy pray for the queen. Instead of conforming with this desire, Knox spoke of her in his usual manner. In this and in other matters he thought that his brethren showed symptoms of waning zeal. His worthy secretary went to an assembly of the clergy, and put it to them that they should back his master in this quarrel, and that with no uncertain sound. By the secretary's report, "they all said that they would bear their part of the burden" with Knox; but they did not act so as to satisfy Knox's secretary of the sufficiency of their zeal. He desired that they should pass an Act of Assembly in support of his master. According to his modest and surely honest chronicle, he put it thus: "I desire your wisdoms to make it manifest and known by some public edict that ye approve his doctrine, consent agree with him that ye are of one mind and judgment with him, and that ye sing all one song; that thereby the rest of ministers bearing part of the burden with him, which in my judgment now lies only on his back, the enemies have no occasion to say—It is only John Knox that speaks against the queen." The assembled clergy, however, would not commit themselves to such a resolution. The secretary admits that he "was not a little in choler;" and he tried to fix them to the point in another shape—getting

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 81.

a protest recorded by a notary that the ministers present had expressed themselves for Knox. Such protestation was taken by a feudal symbol, which had come to be by putting a coin into the notary's hand. Richard Bannatyne took instruments by offering "a plack," a very small copper coin, to "Mr George M'Kesone, solicitor for the Kirk." We are told that "the said Mr George promised to bear witness, as his handwrit hereof testifies, but refused the plack, and said it needed not." Altogether Knox's secretary, Richard Bannatyne, disliked the aspect of the affair. He records the names of those present who would not commit themselves, but whom he endeavoured to commit, and they amount to but eighteen.¹ It may be noticed in passing that there is no account of the affair in such records of the ecclesiastical business of the day as are now known. We are told of a further aggravation, how some out of that small assemblage of brethren actually "travelled" with Knox "that he should pass over all such accusations with silence;" but that was not his way. He still had the pulpit as his place of strength, and would use it so long as his failing limbs could take him up to it; and he answered his discreet friends: "The Kirk may forbid my preaching, but to stop my tongue being in the pulpit it may not; and therefore either let me be discharged, or else let you and the adversaries both look for an answer." The answer came;—he had been accused of railing and sedition in his treatment of Queen Mary, and in repudiating this charge he said: "That I have called her ane obstinate adolatrice, ane that consented to the murther of her awn husband, and ane that has committed whoredom and villanous adultery, I gladly grant, and never minds to deny; but railing and sedition they are never able to prove in me, till they first compel Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, St Paul and others, to recant, of whom I have learned plainly and boldly to call wickedness by its own terms—a fig a fig, and a spade a spade."²

So the conclusion he had come to and would keep at was: "I pray not for her. I answer I am not bound to

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 95, 96.
VOL. V.

² Ibid., 97.
D

pray for her in this place, for sovereign to me she is not ; and I let them understand that I am not a man of law that has my tongue to sell for silver or favour of the world."

Once let loose in this strain, Knox was not to be checked or controlled by others, or perhaps by himself. He turns again and again to the wickedness of the queen, as if revelling in his own wonderful gifts of denunciatory eloquence. His rhetoric, as he sweeps over the political and social condition of the country, is too fierce to be distinct. Yet it is interesting to have from such a source the following, in which two points are brought up—his estimate of his proper duty towards the Government created by the recent revolution, and his view of the limits of his right to direct mankind in the name of the Deity, a view evidently uttered in answer to some taunts about his assuming the sanctity and prerogatives of the prophets of the Bible. The opening of the passage requires that we remember his argument against the right of the female sex to govern, in his 'Blast against the monstrous Regiment of Women : ' "What title she has or ever had to this realm, and to the authority thereof, I list not to enter in contention. How she was dejected from it let the Estates answer for ; me they cannot accuse unless they lie, for hitherto I have lived as a subject and obeyed as a subject to all lawful ordinance of God within this realm. Yet rests one thing is most bitter to me and most fearful, if my accusators were able to prove their accusation—to wit, that I proudly and arrogantly enter in God's secret counsel as that I were called thereto. God be merciful to my accusators of their rash and ungodly judgment. If they understood how fearful my conscience is, and ever has been, to exceed the bounds of my vocation, they would not so boldly have accused me. I am not ignorant that the secrets of God appertain to Him alone ; but things revealed in His law appertain to us and to our children for ever. What I have spoken against the adultery, against the murther, against the pride of that wicked woman, I spake not as one that entered in God's secret counsel ; but being one—of God's

great mercy—called to preach according to His blessed will, revealed in His most Holy Word, have often than once pronounced the threatenings of His law against such as have been of counsel, of knowledge, of assistance or consent, of that innocent blood should be shed.”

This is no doubt vehemently spoken, but in principle it comes to nothing more than an expression of his duty to apply to the conduct of those around him the examples and the precepts of the Bible. But presently, stirred up by the recollection that his own brethren of the clergy had blamed him as committing their Church to extreme views, he spoke in a fashion which might furnish an excuse to those who accused him of claiming a portion with the Scriptural prophets: “Where I am accused of expounding evil and profane things with the Word of God, I divide the Kirk in contrarious factions, I make the religion of Jesus Christ to be evil spoken of, and the whole ministry to be hated and abhorred,—I answer, that when they shall teach me, by God’s plain written Word, that the reproof of vice is a evil and profane thing, and that it is a thing that appertaineth not to the ministry, I shall do as God’s Word commands me. But unto that time, which will not be till the morn after doomsday—and not then—I may hold that sentence and power pronounced and given be God to his prophets—be Jeremiah and Ezekiel—to stand for a perpetual law and rule to all true ministers, which, with God’s assistance, I propose to follow to my life’s end.” Ere he had done with his enemies he favoured them with a brief but emphatic estimate of himself. “What I have been,” he said, “to my country, albeit this unthankful age will not know, yet the ages to come will be compelled to bear witness to the truth.”¹

In comparing this with Knox’s earlier utterances, we miss the old drollery and grotesque ridicule which, like the flavour of acrid fruit, gave a relish to the bitterness, or at least modified its asperity. Here was the old rancour and arrogance without the old liveliness. Indeed on this occasion the mantle of Knox seemed to have fallen for

¹ Bannatyne’s Memorials, 172.

the moment on other shoulders. Alexander Gordon, the Protestant Bishop of Galloway, who had from time to time made eccentric but unfruitful attempts at popularity, achieved a signal success in Knox's own style. He prayed for the queen on account of her exceeding wickedness: "All sinners ought to be prayed for. If we should not pray for sinners, for whom should we pray, seeing that God came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance? Saint David was a sinner, and so was she; Saint David was an adulterer, and so was she; Saint David committed murder (in slaying Uriah for his wife), and so did she. But what is this to the matter?—the more wicked that she be, her subjects should pray for her to bring her to the spirit of repentance."¹

Such matter as this, delivered to a crowded audience, might remind them of the spirit in which Knox, some seven years past, had vindicated his 'Blast against the Regiment of Women' to Queen Elizabeth. Even in this controversy he had the opportunity of going over that ground again. He was twitted with praying for Elizabeth, a woman, and so one who, according to his doctrine, had no right to reign. But this only rankled in a sore, and augmented his wrath. He was one of those whose combative passions grow hotter as the intellectual qualities which moderate and direct them decay. In his policy and his precepts he had shown little of the wit and worldly sagacity that had of old been the effective ministers of his fiery zeal. In the one place where he could neither be controlled nor contradicted—in the pulpit—he was still supreme and terrible. Many have read that exquisite little sketch by James Melville of the old decrepit man, in his dress of marten fur, creeping, with the aid of his zealous secretary, along the street, and helped into the pulpit, "where he behovet to lean at his first entry; but ere he had done with his sermon he was so active and vigorous that he was like to ding the pulpit in blads and fly out of it." The faithful young disciple who saw this had his pen and his tablet to take notes, but to no pur-

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 99.

pose when the passion grew on the preacher: "In the opening up of his text he was moderate; but when he entered to application he made me so grew and tremble that I could not hold a pen to write."¹

But with this one only of his warlike resources remaining, Knox was not the strong man he had been. For some years he had been losing his old power; and to one of his aspiring and domineering temper the change, if he saw it, would be something humiliating. It was not as in the struggle for opinion twenty years earlier, when, fresh from the teaching of the French Huguenots, he came as their representative and the lieutenant of their great chief Calvin. The absolute logic of that school had to be accepted and used as a force for fighting the common enemy. There was no opportunity for compromising, no room for a middle course—whoever was not with him was against him. But the cause of the Reformation was now transferred from the zealous spiritual teacher to the arm of the flesh. It was King's party against Queen's party. And for the shape to be taken by the Reformed Church a new generation of clergy had come forward, who had their own opinions and their own self-interests. Knox was egotistic and autocratic as ever, coming forth as the avowed master and representative of the Kirk both as against Romanism and the Lutheran Church of England. But his health was broken, and at sixty-five he was coming to the close of his career. His younger comrades hardly liked that one who was so little able to fight for them should commit them to extreme views; hence the indifference against which he and his one or two zealous followers chafed.

How far Knox would be supported by his friends and his party had become matter of moment, for a time of sore trial seemed to have come to him. The deportment of Grange was that of one so deeply enraged by the late dispute that the people said he would put Knox to death. So far was this rumour believed that several gentlemen of the south-western portion of Scotland sent Grange a paper of remonstrance against the step they heard he was to take.

¹ Diary, 33.

They are willing, they say, to hold the accusation as false, and excuse themselves for protesting, because "the great care we have of the personage of that man whom our God has made both the first planter and also the chief waterer of the Kirk amongst us moves us to write these few lines unto you, protesting that the death and life of that our brother is to us so precious and dear as is our own lives and deaths."¹

It was a terrible accusation. Such a deed would not have had the poor palliation of long-nourished hatred, political and religious, like the death of Hamilton or even of Murray. He whom the flower of chivalry was to slay was not only the old familiar friend who loved him, but one whom the political conditions of the time had put under his special protection. The castle was the stronghold of the city, and it was under that guardian of the Reformation and the new Government that Knox was safe to act as the chief minister to the citizens. Would the character for chivalrous faith which Grange holds in many eyes have covered this also as it covered the rest?

Let us believe that the rumour was unfounded, and arose from the many anomalies in the acts of a man whose interest it was to convert all who would not follow him through his devious course into enemies. Knox had other causes for fear, as the most conspicuous man of his party, and the only conspicuous man who was not surrounded by soldiers as a military leader. It was the critical time just after the capture of Dumbarton and the death of Hamilton, when projects of retaliation were nourished. Knox's friends urged him to seek safety out of the streets of Edinburgh. They offered to form a guard for his protection. Kirkcaldy forbade this. It was according to military etiquette that the commander of a fortress should suppress any hostile or independent armed assembly under his cannon; but he offered to send a guard to conduct the preacher to and from his church. He further desired some engagement from his new allies of the Hamiltons that they would keep Knox scathless; but they "answered that they

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 81.

could not promise upon their honours, because there was many rascals and others amongst them that loved him not that might do him harm without their knowledge.”¹ It is satisfactory to find enough in all these conditions to justify his retreat, without believing that his old friend and ally thirsted for his blood.

Before his departure, Knox, with a few brethren of his party, held a solemn conference in the castle with Grange and Lethington. How it came about, and what hopes it was expected to fulfil, we have no means of knowing; since, although there exists a picturesque account of the meeting, evidently by Knox himself, it is given without any preparatory explanation or announcement. It was conducted in solemn state as a great diplomatic conference. It thus begins :—

“At our entry to the castle we passed to the great hall on the south side, where soon after Sir James Balfour came to us, and incontinent thereafter the lord duke, and last the captain of the castle, who desired my lord duke and us also to enter within the chamber within the said hall, where the lord secretary was sitting before his bed on a chair.” From the tenor of the conference, it seems to have been intended that Knox should be exempt from the burden and responsibility of speaking for his party, whether on account of his infirmities or any other cause. If it was so, however, his old impetuosity drove him to break through the arrangement, and the discussion ended in a contest of wits between Lethington and him in the old way. There is something deeply interesting in the glimpse afforded to us of the scene in which these two men stand face to face for the last time. On former occasions, if there was a little dialectic skirmishing between them, yet they were in substance fighting together through common dangers for an honest cause. To both the danger had deepened; but it was not the danger of a common fate. To the one it was the question whether the cause he had in constancy maintained was strong enough to protect him; to the other it was the fear that in his desertion he had made a grand

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, III.

mistake, and all his subtle devices had gone to the creation of an engine destined to crush him. The two might almost be said to be placed in the balance, where the safety of the one was the destruction of the other. Both had given the days of their vigorous life to that common cause. Now both were, so far as the body went, decrepit, exhausted men, lingering on the edge of the grave. Knox had but a year before been prostrated by a fit of apoplexy, and the other was stricken with paralysis so deplorably, that even if we make large deductions from contemporary accounts of his state, his retention of his vivacious wit in so frail a tenement of clay must be ranked among marvels in physiology.¹

Winram, the Superintendent of Fife, opened the conference by stating how his brethren, "perceiving the intestine troubles in the commonwealth, thought it became them of their duty to offer their labours and travails, to the end that if it should please God that thereby the same might be stanchd, for the which we are come here to offer our travails and labours as said is." Ere yet there was any answer to this, Knox thought it necessary to break in: "After this proposition silence was kept ane certain space, while I continued the purpose again in this manner: 'My lord, I think our commission extends this far, that seeing your lordships are willing we should travail, as ye have declared by your writing to our brother here, Mr Craig, and we are also very willing to bestow our

¹ Knox's secretary says: "On Tuesday the 10th of April, the head of wit, the secretary, landed in the night at Leith, where he remained till the morning, and was borne up with six workmen with sting and ling, and Mr Robert Maitland hauling up his head; and when they had put him in at the castle gate, ilk ane of the workmen got three shillings, which they receivit grudgingly, hoping to have gotten more for their labours."—Bannatyne's Memorials, 110. There was satisfaction in taking a large account of an enemy's calamity, impelled at that time by an under-current of unavowed belief that it was a blow dealt in punishment for the sufferer's wickedness. To have to tell such a thing may have exercised some soothing influence upon a certain irritability in the annalist's mind about the machinations of Lethington, visible in such interjections as, "God confound his politic brain!" and the like.

labours; then it rests to know and hear of your lordships what heads or articles ye will offer unto us as a ground whereupon we may travail.'” To this answered the lord secretary: “Mr John, ye are overwise. We will make no offers to them that are in the Canongate, for the principals of the nobility of Scotland are here, to whom they that are in the Canongate are far inferiors in that rank; therefore to them we mind not to make offers, for it becomes them rather to make offers to them that are here.” The end was, that if the king’s party should repent of their rebellion, and come back to their duty, the castle party would intercede for them, and endeavour to obtain their exemption from the pains and penalties incurred by their defection. The narrative continues: “Then said I, ‘So, my lords, it appears to me we have the less ado, seeing no ground is offered to us whereon we may travail.’” On this Craig, who seems to have thought it necessary to come back to the business of their mission, said: “But it appears to me that we have somewhat farther to say, that seeing there is ane lawful authority established in the persons of the King and Regent throughout this realm, which ought to be obeyed by all the subjects thereof; and therefore our duty is, as commissioners and members of the Kirk, to admonish every one of your lordships to obey the same.” This brought the discussion to a point, and perhaps it was the point where Lethington wanted to meet the other side without more ado. At all events it brought out his own policy, and compromised to it his comrade Grange. The secret was now to be told why they had to change sides, yet were to call themselves honest. Perhaps it was expected that the explanation, given as it was in solemn conclave with the head and subordinate leaders of the Church to which both parties belonged, would be discussed, if not respectfully accepted, all over Scotland. As it happens, the announcement lay long in unnoticed manuscripts, and only came to light in print at a time when it required some critical inquiry to find out the parties concerned in the controversy.

What Lethington had to explain to the satisfaction of his audience was, why he, who had become Secretary of

State under the Government of the infant king, should hold his office for Queen Mary; and why Grange, who had got the command of the Castle of Edinburgh, also on the king's side, should employ his command on the other. Grange had been put in command of the castle to supersede the dubious Balfour. By all a soldier's loyalty he was bound to the cause of the new order of government under which he had accepted his charge. But there had even been an attempt to bind him by a civil obligation as well as a soldier's faith. To the burghesses of Edinburgh the castle was a formidable neighbour, and in these revolutionary times they were naturally anxious that there should be no mistake on the point how they stood with that neighbour.

To accomplish political objects through the influence of personal obligations, under the forms of law for the protection of private rights, is a peculiarity of Scotland which we have met and are likely to meet. Perhaps it never was carried so far or achieved so little as when it bound Grange by a personal bond to co-operate as governor of the castle with the corporation of Edinburgh in support of the new rule. By this document it was "appointed, agreed, and finally contracted and bounden up betwixt the Right Honourable Sir William Kirkcaldy of Grange, knight, Captain of the Castle of Edinburgh, for himself, kin, friends, servants, assisters, and partakers, on that one part, and the Right Honourable Simon Preston of Craigmillar, of that ilk, knight, Provost of the burgh of Edinburgh, for himself, the bailies, council, and community, and whole inhabitants of the said burgh, on the other part, in manner, form, and effect as after follows." And what follows is a set of conditions, in which some acute conveyancer, enumerating every form of treachery which his fertile imagination can suggest, holds the parties bound to reject every one of them, "according to their bounden duty and right of fidelity given to their most undoubted and native sovereign for maintenance of him and his authority royal."¹

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 163 *et seq.*

Such being the conditions under which power had been given to the coadjutors, it fell to Lethington to explain the use to which that power had been put. Perhaps he never in all his strange career showed such defiant cleverness. The key-note of his explanations was, that there had been a mere scramble for safety in a storm. It was necessary to get rid of Bothwell; since the queen *would* protect him, it was necessary to tie her hands during the riddance. The infant was set up as king that there might be a rallying-point; but no man in his senses supposed that this would or could be a permanent arrangement. He felt that if this bold explanation were a success, then would the finger of scorn be turned from the renegades, and directed towards those who were such fools as to believe them serious when they adopted the course they had abandoned.

To lead to this conclusion, he drew an effective picture of the scene on Carberry Hill and the subsequent infatuation of the queen, as a sea of troubles from which statesmen were justified in seizing the readiest mode of escape, continuing thus: "So that then, we finding no other way to preserve us from inconvenients, we devised to make the cloak of some new authority—even as if ye were passing over to Kinghorn, and the boat took fire, ye would leap in the sea to flee the fire, and finding yourself liable to drown, ye would press again to the boat. Even so the setting up of the king's authority was but ane fetch or shift to save us from great inconvenients; not that ever we meant that the same should stand or continue, as ever thereafter I schaw to my lord regent, willing him to compose and agree the matter."

At this point he tried a touch of that bold hypocrisy with which of old he used to assuage the growing ire of Knox: "And for my own part plainly I confess that I did very evil and ungodly in the upsetting [setting up] of the king's authority, for he can never be justly king as long as his mother lives; and that which I speak the whole noblemen within the town and others here present, I am assured, will affirm the same." Here the duke, Balfour, and Grange gave a nod of acquiescence. A more

full acknowledgment was demanded from Balfour, who said he was privy to the whole affair, and knew the grounds of the proceedings to have been precisely as Lethington described them. Proceeding in the narrator's own words :—

“ Then said I to the secretary : ‘ My lord, I cannot tell what fetches or shifts your lordship has used in these proceedings ; but hereunto let your own conscience accuse yourself before your God, *conscientiam vestram oneramus*. But ane thing well I wot, honest men of simple conscience and upright dealing meant nothing of these your shifts and fetches, but proceeded upon ane honest and constant ground, having the glory of God before their eyes, and the punishment of horrible crimes.’ ‘ Neither,’ said I, ‘ my lord, that godly men of upright dealing has used such shifts or fetches as these of yours are—namely, in such notable and weighty matters ; but ane thing, my lord, I perceive, that methinks God has beguiled you—that howbeit He has used you and your shifts as an instrument to set up the king's authority, yet it appears not that He will set it down again at your pleasure.’ Then said the secretary, ‘ Know ye that ? are ye of God's counsel ? *Quis fuit consiliarius ejus ?* Ye shall see the contrary within few days, and then we will see what obedience ye will give.’ Then said I, ‘ Unto that time, my lord, our argument is good, and ye and others ought to give the king obedience.’” Here the Superintendent of Fife put in the usual form the precept to obey the powers that be. The answer was, that the Romish hierarchy was a constituted power, yet those he addressed had been somewhat zealous in resisting and destroying it. Here Knox broke in. A wicked religion “ tends to the dishonour of the name of God, which in no ways ought to be suffered—yea, not ane hour. But otherwise it is in policy, and chiefly in the established authority of kings and princes ; for howsoever the authority be ance established—I presume by violence and tyranny——”

“ Here the secretary interrupted me and said, ‘ Mr John, I am glad to hear that confession out of your mouth.’ ‘ My lord,’ said I—‘ giving but not granting [admitting]

that so it were, likewise I understand ane lawful ground in the king's authority, and the authority ance established ought to be obeyed.'" Then follow the often-cited precepts in Scripture to obey powers however constituted, with the inference, "And if argument be good that we shall obey the established authority, howbeit it entered in by violence and tyranny, then meikle rather ought we to obey the authority established, the ground whereof is lawful, reasonable, and godly; and if we should enter on discourse, I cannot tell how many authorities are established upon ane lawful ground."

Balfour tried to push him hard on the question how he knew that the king's Government was established. He referred to its adoption by the Estates and acceptance by the people; "'but yet,' said he, 'how know ye that it is established truly?' 'My lord,' said I, 'I can well answer to that argument, for I was present in Parliament, when I both heard and saw the same concluded. If it be true that you are there standing, or that your little dog is lying upon the secretary's lap'—for ane little messan was lying upon his knees—'so it is true that I have said.'"

This gave an opportunity for occupying the broad position that the Parliament of 1567 was unlawful. Lethington, supporting Balfour, declared, "That Parliament is null for many causes, and cannot be judged ane lawful Parliament." "Then said I, 'My lord, if any Parliament was holden in Scotland these seven hundred years, I doubt not but that was ane lawful Parliament both in substance and ceremonies; and what nullity ye can allege, I doubt not but the same may be alleged against any Parliament in Scotland these seven hundred years ago. Men may know what the nullity of this Parliament tends to, seeing our religion was herein established.'"

Lethington then turned very cleverly to the sore subject of the ecclesiastical endowments. The lay friends of the clergy were but employing them for their own purposes, that they might appropriate the patrimony of the Kirk. Here Craig supported his chief with much spirit. If there were evil designs in them, there were worse in those he now addressed. When desired to be more explicit, he

said,—“My lord, it is plainly spoken that those that are here travails only in their proceedings to cloak cruel murderers, and that the consciences of some of you are so pricked with the same that ye will never suffer the nobility to agree.” There was much irritating discussion on matters less broad and emphatic; and at one point we are told, “Here we began to mow, and, as it were, every one to laugh upon ane other, and so raise.” As they were going, however, Lethington took “Mr John” aside for a few parting words on his support of Lennox, who was virtually an Englishman, though born in Scotland. The answer was, that there had been a regent of Scotland—Albany—who was born and bred a Frenchman. Lethington’s reception of this was a curious one: “‘Mr John,’ says he, ‘there is a difference betwixt the twa.’ ‘And what is that,’ said I, ‘my lord?’ ‘We are joined,’ said he, ‘in league and amity with France, but England is our auld enemies.’ ‘My lord,’ said I, ‘that argument now appears nothing, for we have peace and amity with England presently as we have with France;’ and thus we took our leave and came away.”¹

¹ The remarkable document whence this account is taken will be found in Bannatyne’s Memorials (8vo edition, 156-168; 4to edition, 125-132). In making use of the narrative, I dealt with Knox as the avowed reporter and hero of the scene, until I found, a little to my surprise, that no other writer on this period had so placed him. Sir John Dalzell, in his edition of Bannatyne’s Memorials, merely says, “Some singular circumstances appear in this conversation—it is not evident who is the reporter of it” (p. 168). Dr Cook, in his *History of the Church of Scotland* (i. 134), says—“It does not clearly appear from Bannatyne’s Journal who is the reporter of the conference. I thought it was the Superintendent of Fife, but there is one expression which seems to imply that it was a different person. Whoever he was, he was the chief speaker. Wodrow, in his *Life of Craig* (MS.) supposes that Craig was the reporter.” In the face of such remarks, the position I had assigned to Knox could not be taken for granted; but farther consideration placed this conclusion, as I think, beyond all doubt. In the first place, the piece reads like a resumption of the dialogue between the secretary and “Mr John” reported in Knox’s History. It may be questioned if any other than Knox could, in the presence he was in, have made those sharp repartees which remind us of his early vigour. It was an affair in which, from its tenor, only heads of parties were concerned. The very egotism and indubitable

We have seen that the king's party was baffled in an attempt to hold a Parliament in Edinburgh, and the triumph was made more emphatic by the solemn opening of a Parliament in name of the queen. It was but scantily

assumption of the principal place is Knox all through. It would not be worth anything by itself; but it may be noticed, as closely fitting into the reference to the Parliament of 1567, that Knox had much concern with that convention of the Estates. We have seen that he entered a protest there on behalf of the Church; and a minute of attendances, though mutilated, notes the presence of John Knox (Scots Acts, iii. 35). Let us now look at the conditions under which the document has reached us. It was natural that one might be diverted from the supposition of Knox's concern with it, by finding it coming in under the head, "A memorial of sic things as were done in this town of Edinburgh sen the departure of John Knox, minister, out of the same, sore against his will." But the document has been tumbled into its place accidentally, and in fact it stands where it ought not to be, and where it interrupts the sequence of the narrative. It occurs, itself undated, in the diary of events between the 17th and 18th of May. The 17th was a day of bustle and continued fighting, the king's party having nearly taken the town. The business of the day is accounted for to the last, and ends, "This night Captain Moffat, who was hurt before, was buried" (p. 156). At the end of the document the 18th begins with its own events. The narrative would have a legitimate place in the earlier part of the work, among several others where John Knox narrates his own sayings and doings. In fact the earlier part of the work consists of fragments of the continuation of his History, and hence the interest and value of the book. From the documents appended to the edition of it printed for the Bannatyne Club, we know that Richard Bannatyne applied to the General Assembly for facilities to make use of the papers left by Knox, which he thus describes, after mentioning that the History was completed by him down to the year 1564: "So that of things done sensyne, nothing by him is put in that form and order as he hath done the former: yet not the less there are certain scrolls, papers, and minutes of things left to me by him to use at my pleasure, whereof a part were written and subscribed with his own hand, and another by mine at his command; which, if they were collected and gathered together, would make a sufficient declaration of the principal things that have occurred since the ending of his former History at the year foresaid, and so should serve as stuff and matter to any of understanding and ability in that kind of exercise that would apply themselves to make a history, even unto the day of his death." We know that the facilities which Bannatyne desired for using these materials were conceded (prefatory notice to Ban. edit. of Memorials, xix, xx). We know nothing further, however, except what the internal evidence of the Journal supplies. On this point the editor of the Journal, the late Mr Pitcairn, says that "he is now decidedly of

attended. Knox's secretary tells us how "the lords came down upon their foot from the Castle to the Tolbooth—to wit, the duke, Lords Huntly, Home, Maxwell, the Bishop of Athens [otherwise the Bishop of Galloway], Lord Claud, Coldingham, and the Abbot of Kilwinning, with divers others, lairds, as Phairniehurst."¹ Thus the assemblage was held in the Tolbooth, the usual, and, by usage, the legitimate place for the assembling of the Scots Estates. The meeting had an additional sanction in possessing the "honours of Scotland"—the crown, the mace, and sword—all preserved for security, where they still lie, in the strongest fortress of the kingdom at that time, and therefore in the hands of its commander. A letter or message was read from Queen Mary, stating that her abdication had been obtained by force. The business professed to be transacted at Hamilton in 1569 was here

opinion that the present work forms an essential and perhaps the most prominent part of those historical materials left by John Knox for publication as a continuation of his 'History of the Church of Scotland,' and of the reformation of religion in this country. There are frequent instances in the course of Bannatyne's work which show that these 'Memorials' were originally compiled by him almost in the very shape in which they now appear—namely, as a diary or journal of events and occurrences. The editor further observes, that if it be thought too much to concede that the whole, or at least a considerable portion, of this History was virtually composed or dictated by John Knox to his secretary, or that it was revised throughout by him, it seems that numerous entries were made by Knox in Bannatyne's first draft of his Journal, and that many of these insertions were subscribed by Knox in his usual manner, as if in attestation of the various facts and circumstances which he noted at the time."—*Ibid.*, xvii. In searching for the author elsewhere, we are restricted to those eminent Scots preachers of the day who bore the name of John. The first claim would be on the part of Craig, Knox's coadjutor, and his immediate second in power and popularity; but to him a distinct place is assigned in the conference. Next comes John Winram, Superintendent of Fife; but he, too, has his place. We might next look to John Row; but he is cited in the controversy along with John Willock in a manner which shows that he cannot have been present. There remain undisposed of John Erskine of Dun and John Durie, who afterwards became famous for his opposition to the Court, but had scarcely at this time achieved renown.

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 222.

repeated in more solemn and formal shape. The old Government was revived, and there was a sweeping forfeiture of its enemies. Had the queen's party triumphed, the Acts of that Parliament would have received the sanction of royalty, and found their way into the Scots statute-book; but as affairs went, the meeting was only a casual incident in the general confusion.

The date of the opening of this queen's Parliament, the 28th of August, is also the date of an appeal by Lethington to France for aid. It was made in a letter to Beaton, the titular Archbishop of Glasgow, who acted as Queen Mary's ambassador in Paris. Here we find the subtle adept in the received mysteries of statesmanship adjusting and decorating his appeal to suit it to the tendencies of the fellow-labourer who held the same cause in simple fidelity and honest zeal. The text of his pleading is: "I pray you, remonstre to the King of France the necessity in such good manner as you think maist convenient and will best move him to make substantial support both in money, and farther as the cause requires; and assure his majesty, ance dipping earnestly in the cause, it will be easy to reduce this realm to the queen's perfect obedience." That this is the only chance for the cause—that without immediate aid from France he and his party must inevitably be crushed—is told with a cynical distinctness that has in it somewhat of the heroic:¹

"It is convenient you know the state of Scotland truly as it is, whereof you mon make the best, by uttering or disguising so muckle as may serve the turn, and most move the King of France to make support. Whatsom-ever opinion we have had that a great number of Scotland favoured the queen and misliked of her enemies, yet by experience we find but few that take the matter to heart. Many we found that, in private conference with their friends, would lament her cause, and by words profess that they wish well to her majesty, and seem to mis-

¹ Letters to James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, in 'Miscellaneous Papers, principally illustrative of events in the Reigns of Queen Mary and James VI.,' Maitland Club, p. 59 *et seq.*

like the present Government ; but now we have put the matter to that point that deed must try who will set forward her cause and who not, we find very few who put their hands to the plough. Few will mix in the cause, or dip earnestly either to defend her friends or invade her enemies. You know by the letters and memoirs sent to you in April bygone a year in what terms we then stood, and what number of noblemen made some countenance and demonstration that they would then set forth the queen's cause, which company was dispersed to sundry places by the incoming of the Englishmen in May bygone a year ; since which time, for no labours could be made, that number could never to this hour be assembled again in a place. From the first day of September last was till a great part of winter was past, the matter was driven under esperance of the treaty which the Queen of England had in hand, and men had some hope by her means it would be brought to an accord. During that time many gave good words, but no number of noblemen could be moved to assemble in a place. Excuses were aye founded upon the incommodity or unsurety of the roum to meet in ; and the place that was thought by ane end of them, was aye found incommodious for the rest."

Since the month of May, Kirkcaldy had held entire possession of the town, and fortified it as he best could, mounting cannon on the tower of the church of St Giles and in the church itself, which was pierced with embrasures. It was necessary that he should have the municipality at his command. By degrees the municipal and the feudal communities had been mixing with each other. A wealthy merchant would set his foot upon the land and found a territorial house. On the other hand, the burghesses found it expedient to have for their provost or chief magistrate some neighbouring baron of rank or influence, who, profiting in some measure by the position in which they placed him, made common cause with the municipality. Preston of Craigmillar was then provost ; but Grange drove him furth, and set in the civic chair, as his own deputy, his son-in-law, Kerr of Ferniehurst, a notorious commander of Border rievvers, with as little of the

municipal or corporate in his character as could well be. Those inhabitants of Edinburgh who were not prepared to throw their lot into the queen's party were gradually leaving the city. On the departure of some two hundred substantial burgesses, who took up their position with the king's party in Leith, a proclamation was issued confiscating their property if they did not return within twenty-four hours.¹ Both the castle and the town of Edinburgh were thus isolated under the command of Grange. The king's party held their camp at Leith. They had the command of the suburb of Canongate lying between the eastern wall and Holyrood ; and they were sometimes called the lords in Leith, at others the lords in the Canongate. They held the approaches to the broken ground round Edinburgh, and were enabled sometimes to trouble their enemies by cannon mounted on the Calton Hill.

In the war now inevitable the first actual contest came off on the 20th of May. Morton had sent from Dalkeith a party to issue a proclamation in the king's name. On their return, as they passed the east end of the Burghmuir, in the hollow below the ascent to Liberton, they met a party of some seven hundred sent by the garrison to intercept them. There was a fight, in which the castle party were driven back. It was a small affair in itself, but held rank as the first brush in the bitter war round Edinburgh. From the place where it befell it took the ignoble title of the battle of Lousie Law.²

At the beginning of October 1571 the regent's party began to lay out a fortress or fortified camp at Leith, and then it was that the siege of Edinburgh began. From that time to the 30th of July 1572, Scotland was the stage of one of the bitterest civil wars on record. Many as had been the occasions and varied the forms in which the land had been visited by strife and bloodshed, the curse on this occasion took a shape entirely new. The earlier wars of Scotland had lain between natural enemies. We have seen how the Romans, in their mission towards the conquest of the world, had to fight their way in Scotland.

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 227.

² Herries's Memoirs, 135.

There was much bloody work of which we have but faint and indistinct record, as the several tribes settled themselves down after the fall of the empire. The pressure inward of the Norse invasion was attended by continual fighting. Then came the three-hundred-year war of independence. It was varied by occasional turbulence and outbreak, as in the affair in which James III. lost his life; but these were of the nature of casualties soon over. Now for the first time in their long history were the people of Scotland arrayed under separate banners and a separate allegiance, in that most dismal of quarrels, a real civil war.

The king's party kept up communication with the English Government. Before coming to close issue they had a visit from Drury, making vain efforts at conciliation. They were, however, as yet unaided from England, and had to fight their own battle. The queen's party received aid from France; but it was small, for the French Government of the day had serious business at home. When this aid from France, however, was added to the defection of Grange, the two sufficed to render a weak cause strong enough to maintain a protracted and painful vitality. The queen's party were able to keep a large portion of the country in turbulence; but it was only within the walls of Edinburgh that the queen reigned. In Fifeshire, where Grange had his territorial influence, the Government was so strong that Knox sought and found a safe retreat in St Andrews. The bulk of the eastern Lowlands of Scotland, with the exception of Edinburgh, was under the king's rule as far as Aberdeen. In the west the Hamiltons divided the influence with the Government, and on the Borders the Maxwells and Kerrs did their best to turn the mischief and plundering to the prejudice of king's rather than of queen's men. In the north the influence of the Huntly family was almost sufficient to hold rule in the name of the queen. The clergy there appealed to the sympathy of their brethren, telling how they were required to obey orders from the keepers of Edinburgh Castle, and desiring to be informed how they should act in the hard

alternative: "Ane of two things are offered unto us—viz., death if we be convict of treason, or else obedience to the queen's Parliament and praying for her."¹

The chief actions of the war were in this corner of it, and lay between the Gordons, under Huntly's brother, the Laird of Auchendoun, and their neighbours and natural enemies the Forbeses. In one battle, on the 9th of October, the Forbeses were defeated, leaving one hundred and twenty dead. Two hundred hagbutiers were sent from the south to help the Master of Forbes, who, thus strengthened, thought to attack the Gordons in their stronghold of Aberdeen. He crossed the Dee; but Auchendoun, who was prepared, met him at the Craibstone, "where," says a chronicler of the day, "it was fochten furiously on baith sides for the space of an hour, till at last the victory inclined to the lieutenant, and the Forbeses put to such a flight that the pursuit endured four miles of length. The Master of Forbes was taken prisoner with two hundred of his horsemen." On his side the deaths were three hundred, and on the other thirty.² The chronicler continues to tell of Auchendoun, that "what glory and renown he obtained by these two victories was all casten down by the infamy of his next attempt; for immediately after his last conflict he directed his soldiers to the Castle of Towie, desiring the house to be rendered to him in the queen's name, whilk was obstinately refused by the lady, and she burst forth with certain injurious words. And the soldiers, being impatient, by command of their leader, Captain Ker, fire was put to the house, wherein she and the number of twenty-seven persons were cruelly brunt to the death."

The scene supposed to have passed within that burning house—a scene in which the heroic mother is tortured between the duty of feudal hatred and the appeals of her smothering children—is one of the finest among the

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 215.

² Historie of King James the Sext, 96; Bannatyne's Memorials, 212. The "Craib-stane" is still shown beside the old road from Aberdeen to the Bridge of Dee.

touching and beautiful pictures in the popular ballads of the Scots people.¹

This episode in the north is sadly typical of the whole tenor of that wretched war. It was a conflict all worked

1 “ ‘Gie up your house ye fair ladie,
Gie up your house to me;
Or I will burn yoursell therein,
But and your babies three.

‘I winna gie up, ye false Gordon,
To nae traitor as thee;
Though you should burn myself therein,
But and my babies three.

But reach my pistol, Glaud, my man,
And charge ye weel my gun;
For if I pierce not that bloody butcher,
My babes will be undone.’

She stood upon the castle wa’,
And let two bullets flee;
She missed that bloody butcher’s heart,
And only grazed his knee.

Oh then bespoke her youngest son,
Sat on the nurse’s knee:
‘Oh mother dear, gie ower your house,
For the reek o’t smothers me.

‘I would gie a’ my goud, my bairn,
Sae would I gie my fee,
For ae blast o’ the westlan win,
To blaw the reek frae thee.

‘But I winna gie up my bonny house
To nae sic traitor as he;
Come weel, come wae, my jewels fair,
Ye maun take share wi’ me.’

Oh then bespoke her daughter dear—
She was baith jimp and sma’—
‘Oh row me in a pair o’ sheets,
And tow me ower the wa’.’

They rowed her in a pair o’ sheets,
And towed her ower the wa’;
But on the point of Edom’s spear
She got a deadly fa’.

Oh bonny bonny was her mouth,
And cherry were her cheeks;
And clear, clear was her yellow hair
Whereon the red blood dreeps.

Then wi’ his spear he turned her ower,
Oh gin her face was wan!
He said, ‘Ye are the first that e’er
I wished alive again.

out in details so small as to make the affair of the Craibstone a conspicuous battle. As it was not adorned by great and gallant acts, so was it destitute of the casual forbearances and generousities exacted by the laws of war from national enemies. To each party the other was a pack of traitors and rebels to be extirpated by the readiest available means. Thus was the country thinned of its fighting men in inglorious detail. It was as when two combatants, having inflicted on each other many bleeding wounds, grow weaker and weaker, until neither has strength to release the other with a death-blow.

It scarcely varied this dreary history of calamity, and passed almost unnoticed at the time, that in February 1572 Randolph and Drury paid a diplomatic visit to Grange and his companions in the castle, and made a vain effort to bring him to terms. Sir James Melville felt, as all Scotsmen who could keep free of the ferocious struggle must have felt, that it was an utter waste of warfare, pointing to no practical conclusion save the ruin of the country. He did something to appease the quarrel; and though we have only his own account of his intervention, we can believe enough of it to justify the opinion that no other man did so much for the promotion of peace. He was a man of a character and temper rare in that age—very pacific, yet no coward; a dealer with all parties, yet never, as it would seem, suspected of selling one party to another. His dealing towards Queen Mary was that of the zealous and dutiful servant who deeply laments the follies, and worse than follies, of his mistress, striving ever to put the best face on her wild career. He thought, and perhaps not unnaturally, that Cecil's Government fostered the quarrel in Scotland for selfish political objects; and he describes the tenor of his

He turned her ower and ower again.
 Oh gin her skin was white!
 I might hae spared that bonny face,
 To been some man's delight."

The ballad is not to be accepted as a precisely accurate history of the tragedy; but it is a fair specimen of the character of the legends bequeathed by the miserable struggle, to interest and excite the group gathered round the Scots peasant's fireside.

own persuasions when he said that this was a policy "whilk my Lord of Mar's friends perceived, and himself at length ; wherethrough he began to be caulder in the quarrel, and drew himself to Stirling, and advised with his friends what was meetest to be done, alleging that he could see nothing but the wreck of the country under pretext of King's and Queen's faction or authority ; and that neither King nor Queen was in either of their minds, but only profit by their own partialities and ambitious greediness and vengeance—England kindling up both parties, and then laughing them all to scorn." ¹

This petulant remark, by one deeply vexed at heart, has been considered sufficient authority for the belief, that the Government of England had deliberately adopted the wily policy of inciting the two parties against each other with the ultimate object of rendering Scotland a weakened neighbour. But we need not search so deeply for the policy of Elizabeth's Government. It may suffice that it had not reached the conclusion of taking a step both costly and dangerous. England, as we shall presently see, was at that time hampered by friendly relations with France, which must be broken ere an army could be sent to suppress the queen's party. A man so wise as Cecil must have seen the mischief done by the last act of interference : it had consolidated the opposition to the regency, and was the excuse, if not the motive, for the defection of Grange and Lethington. The opportunity for England would be when she could strike one great blow, and then vanish from the scene, leaving a party predominant and strong enough to govern unassisted. Meanwhile the queen's was the weaker party, and therefore, as the natural condition of exhaustive war, it must die first. Hence it was propitious that there were two men of influence, who were so far also men of moderation, that, admitting this to be the situation, they desired that quarter should be given to and accepted by that party, and so much of the national life saved. These were Mar the regent and Melville.

¹ *Memoirs*, 243.

The common ground on which they thought both parties could meet was, that fighting under existing conditions was a mere waste of the nation's blood, since the object of dispute—the queen—was kept out of the hands of both parties. Though her own friends should be victorious in the face of all the chances against them, yet would their victory be useless so long as Queen Elizabeth retained possession of their mistress. It was to Randolph that Melville attributed the treacherous stirring of the strife; and when Killigrew came to Scotland in his place, Melville said he found in him a friend of peaceful counsels. On the queen's side it was Grange who had peace or war in his hands. He would listen to no terms committing him to the abandonment of the cause of which he had made himself the special champion. Melville says he found him open to reason on the folly of fighting on, in the mean time, under conditions certain to render success itself barren, and that he was himself heartily backed by the Regent Mar in his pacific persuasions. Drury, on the part of England, and Le Croc, the ambassador from France, helped in the same direction; and at last, on the 1st of August 1572, a truce or "abstinence" for two months was adjusted. From the benefit of the truce certain conspicuous men were excepted—the surviving remnant of those openly accused of the murder of Darnley, and those charged with the murder of Murray—Bothwell, a follower of his named Patrick Wilson, Ormiston of that ilk, Patrick Hepburn of Beanston, James Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, and John Hamilton, his brother. A social feature of the age was reflected in a general exception in one group of "the whole thieves and broken men, inhabitants of the Borders and Hilands, disturbers of the public peace betwixt this realm and England, and oppressors of the peaceable subjects of this realm." Yet they were not to be responsible for acts of war done by them under the command of leaders in the conflict, but only for the mischiefs they had transacted on their own account. As some people had gained possession during the struggle of other men's lands, it was stipulated that

during the truce they were to retain these possessions, and reap the fruits of them.¹

Before the next and concluding act of the war opens, it is proper to trace the threads of several events, some of them beginning at an earlier date than the truce, and all combining to influence the destinies of the two parties.

Soon after Knox left Edinburgh the churches were closed, and, as a contemporary says, the booming of the cannon superseded the sound of the bell calling men to prayer. So long as the churches remained open, Knox's pulpit was occupied by that Alexander Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, whose peculiar vindication of prayers for the queen has been already cited. Though acting as a minister of the new Church, he retained his bishopric, and he is even said to have handed it over to his son. He held at the same time the titular distinction of Archbishop of Athens, conferred on him, it must be presumed, before his conversion to the new Church; and he often appears with that title in the documents and chronicles of the period.² His position associates itself with some peculiarities of the condition and history of the Church at that period—peculiarities on which the clergy of that Church in later times have naturally been loath to enlarge.

As yet there was no Act of Parliament acknowledging a change in the polity or structure of the Church. Whatever the Book of Discipline professed to effect towards the establishment of a Presbyterian polity was ecclesiastical doctrine, not law. Not only did bishops still remain, but also the Dignitaries of the Regulars, such as Abbots and Priors. As a secular matter, and apart from the internal regulations of the fraternities, the only difference in their position since 1560 was, that vacancies came to be filled by Protestants, and sometimes by laymen. Murray, as we have seen, was Prior of St Andrews. On his death Queen Mary made an empty gift of the priory to Grange, on which Randolph wrote to him, saying: "Brother William, it was indeed most wonderful unto me when I heard that you should become a prior. That vocation agreeth not

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 241.

² See Keith's Catalogue, 166.

with anything that ever I knew in you, saving for your religious life led under the cardinal's hat when we were both students in Paris."¹

When the archbishopric of St Andrews became vacant by the death of John Hamilton, an edict or rescript was sent to the dean and chapter of the diocese to choose a new archbishop; and Morton, who was present, guided the selection towards his own nominee, John Douglas. Knox was requested to assist at his inauguration, but refused to do so. The task devolved chiefly on his friend Winram, the Superintendent of Fife, who, for reasons not explained, performed the ceremony, although it superseded him in the chief ecclesiastical command of the district. Knox did not direct his denunciations against the principle of Prelacy, but against the parties to the transaction. He could not countenance the appropriation of the revenues of the see by Morton, whether he would have assented to their passing into the hands of one well chosen from the clergy or not. He objected to the man selected as too old and feeble for the heavy load to be borne by him. From some further transactions of the period we shall see that he was not at that time an opponent of the order of bishops.

In January 1572 there was a gathering of the clergy at Leith. It was called a Convention, and it was said not to be a formal General Assembly; but it is not easy to determine what conditions were absolutely necessary to the constitution of an Assembly in that early period of the Protestant Church. A committee of their number met with a committee of the Privy Council, and arranged with them a Concordat as to the dealing with Church dignities. The largest questions were on this occasion adjusted with a speed and facility rare in ecclesiastical procedure; and, as it has been justly remarked, "it is impossible to believe that the Convention and Privy Council would have worked with such perfect harmony unless the whole proceedings had been previously arranged."²

¹ Cited, P. F. Tytler.

² Cunningham's Church History, i. 425.

They prepared together certain adjustments, in which it is without equivocation set forth "that the names and titles of Archbishops and Bishops are not to be altered or innovate, nor yet the bounds of the dioceses confounded ; but to stand and continue in time coming as they did before the reformation of religion—at least to the king's majesty's majority or consent of Parliament." Farther, "that there be a certain assembly or chapter of learned ministers annexed to every metropolitan or cathedral seat." It was provided that archbishops and bishops should have no further jurisdiction in spiritual matters than the superintendents had exercised, "until the same be agreed upon." It was farther decided "that all archbishops and bishops be subject to the Kirk and General Assembly thereof *in spiritualibus*, as they are to the king *in temporalibus*."¹

A form for the appointment of prelates was adopted, exactly in the spirit of the much-ridiculed *congé d'élire* of the Church of England. The sovereign was to direct the chapter to make an election, "naming and recommending" to them the person on whom their choice is to fall, with the preamble that he is recommended because of "calling to our remembrance the virtue, learning, good conversation, and other godly qualities of our trusty and well-beloved B. C. preacher of the Word of God." The dignitaries of the regulars were also to be maintained although the whole monastic brotherhood had been dispersed, because the holder of each dignity among the regulars "must supply the place of one of the ecclesiastical Estate in Parliament."² It was considered undesirable that the reformation in religion should interfere with the constitution of that great ruling power, the Estates of the realm. These doings of the Church were accompanied by instructions that the clergy should reside within their charges, and that those appointed to offices of dignity should be properly qualified. The qualification extended not only to the bishoprics, but to the abbacies and priories, for which it must have been difficult to find any qualifica-

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, i. 209.

² Ibid., i. 210.

tions in harmony alike with the original objects of these institutions and the new order in Church and State; but these instructions regarding qualification are of too general and unexact a character to have had much effect in practice.

When these arrangements came up for final consideration at an Assembly held at Perth in 1572, they were allowed to pass with a grumble. The Assembly "finally concluded for the time upon the said heads and articles," appending the following explanation: "In the whilks being considered and read, are found certain names, such as Archbishop, Dean, Archdean, Chancellor, Chapter; whilks names were found slanderous and offensive, to the ears of many of the brethren appearing to sound to Papistry. Therefore the hail Assembly in one voice, as well they that were in commission at Leith as others, solemnly protests that they intend not by using such names to ratify, consent, and agree to any kind of Papistry or superstition, and wishes rather the said names to be changed into others that are not slanderous or offensive. And in like manner protests that the said heads and articles agreed upon be only received as an interim until further and more perfect order be obtained at the hands of the king's majesty's regent and nobility; for the whilk they shall press as occasion shall serve." A few suggestions were dropped about a change of nomenclature to avoid the scandal of Popery, as that "the Chapter be called the Bishop's Assembly," and the dean the moderator of that Assembly.¹

Before the sittings of the Assembly at Perth were ended, a letter from Knox was read to them. It was short, but sorrowful and apprehensive. "Albeit," it went, "I have tane my leave not only of you, dear brethren, but also of the world and all worldly affairs; yet remaining in the flesh, I could not nor cannot cease to admonish you of things which I know to be most prejudicial to the Kirk of Christ Jesus within this realm. Above all things, preserve the Kirk from the bondage of the Universities.

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, i. 246.

Persuade them to rule themselves peaceably, and order the schools in Christ; but subject never the pulpit to their judgment, neither yet exempt them from your jurisdiction." The universities will not be found among those established terrors of the Church of which it is the duty of the faithful watchman from time to time to warn his slumbering brethren. There were projects then for increasing the wealth, and consequently power, of these institutions; and Knox himself had lent these projects a hearty helping hand. If there was any ground for alarm about the universities becoming dangerously powerful, it must have been ephemeral. In truth, however, this protest touched a grievance personal to Knox himself, and vividly exemplifying a signal peculiarity in his character. In fixing his quarrel on the University of St Andrews, he uttered a suspicion that the institution held too high a place in reference to the Church, and professed even to exercise some authority over Churchmen. "I protest," he said, "that neither the pulpit of St Andrews, neither yet of any congregation within the realm, be subject to the censure of the schools, university, or faculty within the same." Whatever he thought he saw of this character was much aggravated in his eyes, if it were not entirely suggested, by one of the professors failing to attend his preaching. The truant was called on to give a reason "why he came not to the said Mr Knox's sermon, as he was appointed by the superintendent and by the bishop, Mr John Douglas." Desertion from the preaching by those whom he considered within his own flock was ever a serious offence in Knox's eyes, and we have already seen how he censured Queen Mary for her neglect of this duty. It could be no vindication to the professor, whose name was Archibald Hamilton, that his reason for absenting himself was that Knox "affirmed in his teaching that Hamiltons were murtherers." He was first brought before the archbishop and other authorities, and afterwards had to answer "in the inner chamber of Mr Knox, in the new lodging of the abbey;" and "by him being charged for not coming to his preaching," he spoke back upon his accuser in a fashion to which Knox was little accustomed:

“That neither he nor any other faithful in the university be thralld to any minister who exempts himself from order and godly discipline; and chiefly when the minister shall take that licence, that doctrine to publish in the pulpit which afore ordinary judges he refuses to defend in schools to show it to be consonant with the Word of God.”¹

In the document containing the protest against the aggrandisement of the universities, some who adopt the current opinions about Knox’s opinions on Church government might look for a testimony against another and closer danger, but look in vain. Had he seized the occasion to lift his protest against Prelacy, beyond doubt he would have made his meaning understood; for it was one of his qualifications, that in dealing with a question he never uttered an uncertain sound. Nor is the alternative open, that he was dealing solely with another question. The question of Prelacy was practically in his hands. His letter was accompanied by certain suggestions for the removal of minor practical abuses, some of which he considered to be injurious to the proper ordering of the office of a bishop.²

¹ Bannatyne’s Memorials, 262, 263.

² Bannatyne’s Memorials, 245-248. Those who hold that Knox was an enemy to an Episcopal hierarchy would do well to study the following articles in a memorandum sent by him along with his warning about the universities:—

“To suit at the regent, that no gift of any bishopric or other benefice be given to any person contrary to the tenor of the Acts made in the time of the first regent of good memory; and they that are given contrary the said Acts, or to any unqualified person, may be revoked and declared null by an Act of Secret Counsell; and that all bishoprics vacant may be presented, and qualified persons nominated thereunto, within a year after the vacating thereof, according to the order taken in Leith by the commissioners of the nobility and of the Kirk in the month of January last; and in special to complain upon the giving of the bishopric of Ross to Lord Methven.

“That no pensions of benefices great or small be given by simple donation of my lord regent without consent of the possessor of the said benefices having title thereto, and the admission of the superintendent or commissioner of the province where this benefice lyeth, or of the bishops lawfully elected according to the said order taken at Leith; and desire an Act of Counsell to be made thereupon unto the

What is chiefly remarkable in the expressions of the period about this change is the public indifference with which it was received. In fact the great quarrel between

next Parliament, wherein the same be specially inacted, with inhibition to the Lords of Session to give any letters or decreets upon such simple gifts of benefices or pensions, not being given in manner above rehearsed; and that the Kirk presently assembled declare all such gifts null so far as lyeth in their power.

“That an Act be made decerning and ordaining all bishops admitted by the order of the Kirk now received, to give account of their whole rents and intromission therewith once in the year, as the Kirk shall appoint for such causes as the Kirk may easily consider the same to be most expedient and necessary.”—Works, vi. 610.

There is a matter that would be too trifling for notice were it not that it harmonises with what little else we have to show how Knox felt at this moment. Is it the appearance of his name, along with that of the new archbishop, as warranting or approving a celebrated sermon preached before the regent by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline :—

“This sermon was presentit to the Kirk, red and approvit be the persounis underwrittin, appointit thairunto be the Assemblie haldin at Perth 6 Augusti, anno 1572.

“J. SANCT ANDROIS.

“JHONE ERSKYN.

“M. JHON WYNRAM.

“WILLIAME CRYSTESONE, M. of Dundie.

“JHON KNOX,

with my dead hand but glaid heart, praising God that of His mercy He levis such light to His Kirk in this desolation.”

Would the ardent pupil of the Huguenots, on whom the mantle of Knox was thrown by general acclamation—would Andrew Melville have written his name below “St Andrews” in any document relating to the Church? Would he not rather that it had been too truly “dead” to serve him in recording such a testimony?

A controversial writer, who was at the trouble of noting the occasions on which Knox would have lifted his protest against Prelacy, had such been his opinion, concludes with more truth than the positive assertions of polemical disputants sometimes observe: “Thus Mr Knox, when he had the fairest occasions, the strongest temptations, the most awakening calls, when it was most reasonable for him to have declared for the divine right of Presbytery and the unlawfulness of Prelacy, is still silent in the matter, or rather, on all occasions, proceeds on suppositions and reasons from principles, fairly allowing the lawfulness of Prelacy, which is a sufficient proof he was not of the persuasion of our modern Presbyterians.”—Short Narrative of the Government of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Union, II.

Prelacy and Presbytery had not yet begun. No form and method of the new Church had yet so deeply rooted itself in the esteem or the hatred of any large portion of the nation as to find enthusiastic champions or enemies. A Protestant Episcopacy leaned to English practice, and this would naturally bring it little recommendation. The Presbyterian arrangements, on the other hand, were a fresh importation from France. But those inclining in either direction had to remember that the old Church, then in great power, and in one of its most menacing moods, might some day sweep the whole question between forms for a Protestant Church off the face of practical politics.

The new bishops were neither rich nor powerful ; for the temporalities of their sees had enriched laymen, and as Churchmen they were under the rule of the Assemblies of the Church, of which they were but individual members.

The chief hostility incurred by them was in the shape of not very bitter raillery. James Melville tells of Patrick Adamson, whom we shall hereafter find in a conspicuous place : " I heard a sermon of his the week after the Bishop [of St Andrews] was made, upon an extraordinary day, that he might have the greater audience, wherein he made three sorts of bishops—my lord bishop, my lord's bishop, and The Lord's bishop. ' My lord bishop,' said he, ' was in the Papistry ; my lord's bishop is now when my lord gets the benefice, and the bishop serves for nothing but to make his title sure ; and The Lord's bishop is the true minister of the Gospel.' " ¹ The new dignitaries got from the populace the name of the Tulchan bishops. A tulchan, an old Scots word of unknown origin, was applied to a stuffed calf-skin which was brought into the presence of a recently-calved cow. It was an agricultural doctrine of that age, and of later times, that the presence of this changeling induced the bereaved mother easily to part with her milk. To draw what remained of the bishops' revenues, it was expedient that there should be bishops ; but the revenues were not for them, but for the lay

¹ Diary, 32.

lords, who milked the ecclesiastical cow. "For," says James Melville, "every lord got a bishopric, and sought and presented to the kirk such a man as would be content with least, and get them most, of tacks, feus, and pensions. Among the rest, the Earl of Morton got the bishopric of St Andrews after the hanging of John Hamilton, and presented thereto that honourable father of the university as rector thereof for the present, Mr John Douglas, a good, upright-hearted man, but ambitious and simple, not knowing wha dealt with him. I heard Mr Knox speak against him—but sparingly, because he loved the man, and with regret, saying, 'Alas for pity to lay upon an auld weak man's back that whilk twenty, of the best gifts, could not bear ! it will wrack him and disgrace him.'"¹

If there are any who attribute Knox's conduct at this period to dotage, their conclusion has such support as the wasting away of the tenement of clay can give to it. He was close to the end of his busy life ; and we may as well follow it to the end before taking up the thread of the narrative. The remnant of his physical powers was departing by daily exhaustion, and yet there were exciting incidents in store for him. He had, as we have seen, to leave Edinburgh, seeking refuge in St Andrews ; and now a truce had been adjusted, and his old congregation appealed to him to return. He had, as we shall see elsewhere, an opportunity of lifting his protest against the greatest crime of the age. This, and his other efforts to do his ministerial duties and fight out his old battles, are minutely recorded by his attendant, Richard Bannatyne, down to his death on the 24th of November 1572.²

If some distinct traces of his public conduct are not to be found in the preceding pages, these have been written in vain. The inner character of the man, as made up of the motives on which he acted, has been so torn between contending zealots, that to set it apart in peaceful composure, and contemplate it with perfect candour, is such a task as it would be hopeless to perform with satisfaction. In fact it is out of that great contest which has for cen-

¹ Diary, 31.

² Memorials, 288.

turies raged around his name that his great fame has grown. In his day he was an all-important man in Scotland, and of some consequence in England on account of his influence in his own country. But he was little known elsewhere. While the name of his quiet neighbour Buchanan spread over all literature, and was repeated in every university and cluster of learned men, the contemporary notices of Knox are extremely scanty, and, from uncertainty in spelling, not easily identified. When contemporary foreign writers name him, it is generally to commend his services in a branch of that contest in which Calvin and Beza were the commanders. Nor was this an entirely false appreciation of his place, for he did implicitly the work which they had planned. He was no deviser of creeds and organisations; he had nothing original about him but his individuality of character and his power over his native tongue.

The tokens of egotism and arrogance abounding in his speeches and writings have naturally courted censorious criticism. But whether these qualities are to be denounced or approved, they are to be weighed in mightier scales than the social frailties commonly expressed by these terms. His impersonation of self, his "I, John Knox," and his assumption of authority, come from a source deeper than idle parade. They were something akin to the personal state and high authority of the prophet in the old dispensation. He seeks no constituted authority either by hierarchical rank or popular vote. He holds his commission from a higher power than man can wield. He is found alluding occasionally to the opportunity he had of being a wealthy bishop in England; and he does so not in the spirit of one declining authority, but of one who has been selected to exercise it in a higher sphere. The prophet's gift of foretelling future events he seems to have handled cautiously and moderately; but he did enough to show that he claimed it, and so drew a foul jest from Lethington on the frailty of the human clay to which his prophetic powers were allied. What chiefly suited him among the old prophetic missions was that of the corrector of human principalities and powers—the

direct agent of the Deity to check their exorbitance and punish their excesses. How extensive a jurisdiction he would have thus claimed may in some measure be seen in a study of his 'First Blast of the Trumpet of Defiance.' It would apparently have come out with still greater force and distinctness had he fulfilled an intention he entertained of publishing a "second blast." The tenor it would have followed may however be seen in certain propositions which "by God's grace" he intends "to entreat in the second blast." In examining the nature of the authority over temporal rulers thus asserted, it is safe to believe that Knox would not have permitted that authority to be vested in any other hands than his own.¹ The times upon which his fate was cast afforded him, as we have seen, brilliant opportunities for the exercise of this duty of rebuke. Amid the storm and darkness in which he was departing, perhaps the keenest bitterness of all was the obduracy of that never-forgotten greed shown by his zealous lay associates in keeping to themselves the wealth of the Church. In July before his death we find him writing to his friend the Laird of Pittarrow: "If they can have the Kirk lands to be annexed to their houses, they appear to take no more care of the instruction of the ignorant, and of the feeding of the flock of Jesus Christ, than ever did the Papists, whom we have condemned, and yet are worse ourselves in that behalf. For they, accord-

¹ "1. It is not birth only, nor propinquity of blood, that maketh a king lawfully to reign above a people professing Christ Jesus and His eternal verity; but in his election must the ordinance which God hath established in the election of inferior judges be observed.

"2. No manifest idolater, nor notorious transgressor of God's holy precepts, ought to be promoted to any public regiment, honour, or dignity, in any realm, province, or city, that hath subjected itself to Christ Jesus and to His blessed Evangel.

"3. Neither can oath nor promise bind any such people to obey and maintain tyrants against God and against His truth known.

"4. But if either rashly they have promoted any manifest wicked person, or yet ignorantly have chosen such a one, as after declareth himself unworthy of regiment above the people of God (and such be all idolaters and cruel persecutors), most justly may the same men depose and punish him that unadvisedly before they did nominate, appoint, and elect."—Works, iv. 539.

ing to their blind zeal, spared nothing that might either have maintained or holden up that which they took for God's service; but we, alas! in the midst of the light, forget the heaven and draw to the earth."¹

His personal character was well abused. Some of his opponents charged him with acts of profligacy, which were put in a grotesque shape that they might make him ridiculous as well as odious.² But this was the lot of every public man in that day, and it was measured out to each in proportion to the enmity he might succeed in exciting. Personal defamation was almost as much the etiquette in controversy then as the sneer about folly and conceit in the present day. Knox himself was unscrupulous in flinging vituperations about when his blood was heated by controversy; and though many of the charges uttered by him were true, others were probably as groundless as the aspersions on himself. We may the more readily disbelieve the charges of ordinary immorality, that they are accompanied by a story, how in his old age he, by the aid of Satan, got a young and noble lady to love him and become his wife. His marriage in 1564 to Margaret Stewart, a daughter of Lord Ochiltree, from wide inequality of age and social incongruities, was one of the unions that awake gossip and criticism even among those who are not hostile.

¹ Works, vi. 617.

² For these charges see 'Calvino-Turcismus, id est Calvinisticæ Perfidie cum Mahometana collatio,' by William Reginald, an Englishman, p. 260; 'Ane Catholik and facile Traietise,' by John Hamilton, p. 60 (this is the murderer of Brissot already referred to); 'De Scotorum Fortitudine,' by David Chambers, p. 276; 'The Disputation concerning the controversit Headdis of Religion, halden in the Realme of Scotland,' by Nicol Burne, p. 143.

The foundation of these scandals appears to have been certain accusations made by an excited woman named Eufame Dundas to an Edinburgh mob; and probably they would never have left the High Street to be found in learned men's books, had not the magistrates arraigned her for having "spoken divers injurious and slanderous words, baith of the doctrine and ministers, and in especiall of John Knox." The accusation thus came into the records of the Town Council of Edinburgh, where also it is recorded that Eufame denied having ever made such charges.—See extracts from Council Records, June 18, 1563, in Kirkton's History, 22.

The Stewarts of Ochiltree descended from the Regent Albany, and consequently from the royal house of Stewart, and the many revolutions of the period seem to have suggested that the great ecclesiastical leader may even have had dynastic projects in this union.¹ And however preposterous we may count all such conjectures when they brought John Knox into the speculations about the succession to the crown, yet the claims of the family he became allied to—the Ochiltree Stewarts—were, as we shall find, referred to twenty years afterwards, as revealing the source whence a political adventurer who became supreme in Scotland was believed to draw his expectations of permanent power.

Of the charges against him of a more malignant kind, if they excite curiosity, it is only to help the impartial investigator to the conclusion that Knox practised fairly the ascetic creed he taught. But this creed tolerated things which might surprise some Puritans of the present day. He had no objection to entertaining his political friends, for the discussion of public affairs, at a four-o'clock supper on Sunday; and he would not grudge them a cup of generous wine on the occasion. The faithful attendant who scrupulously records all that he did day by day as he was nearing the grave, tells us this among

¹ Dr M'Crie says: "The Popish writers, who envied the honours of the Scottish Reformer, have represented this marriage as a proof of his great ambition, and in the excess of their spleen have ridiculously imputed to him the project of aiming to raise his progeny to the throne of Scotland, because the family of Ochiltree was of the blood-royal."—*Life*, 217. The lady's high descent was noticed by gossips who were not among Knox's polemical opponents. Randolph noted to Cecil, while the wedding was a matter of rumour: "Your honour will take it as a great wonder when I shall write unto you that Mr Knox shall marry a very near kinswoman of the duke's, a lord's daughter, a young lass not above sixteen years of age. I rather think that you will laugh at my madness thus to write so great and unlikely a matter than that you will believe that it is true."—*Calendar of State Papers (Foreign)*, 60. And two months later, when the rumour is confirmed (13th March 1564): "Mr Knox has been twice proclaimed in the church to be married upon Palm Sunday to Margaret Steward, daughter to the Lord Ochiltree, whereat the queen storms wonderfully, for that she is of the blood and name."—*Ibid.*, 84.

the rest: "The Saturday, John Durie and Archibald Stewart came in about twelve hours, not knowing how sick he was; and for their cause [he] came to the table, which was the last time that ever he sat at any thereafter, for he caused pierce ane hogshead of wine which was in the cellar, and willed the said Archibald send for the same as long as it lasted, for he would never tarry until it was drunken."¹

A saying of Morton over Knox's grave has often been misquoted. As related by James Melville, the only authority for it: "He loved Mr Knox while he was alive. At his death and burial he gave him an honourable testimony, 'that he neither feared nor flattered any flesh.'"²

There is a well-known apophthegm about the levelling even of heroes in the estimation of their valets. It is seldom that we have the hero drawn for us by the domestic. Richard Bannatyne, the author of the *Journal* so often cited in these pages, stood to Knox in a position scarcely paralleled at the present day, except in some measure by the clerks of the Solitaries who live in the Inns of Court in London. He always calls himself servant, but he was also clerk or secretary. When he has recorded the last scene, he pours forth in mingled wailing and laudation an estimate of his old master which may possibly do more to reconcile some people to the character of the great polemic than all the declamations that have been thundered in his praise:—

¹ Bannatyne's *Memorials*, 283. Randolph, in one of his newsletters to Cecil, dated 30th November 1562, tells how, "upon Sunday at night, the duke supped with Mr Knox, where the duke desired that I should be. Three special points he hath promised to perform to Mr Knox before me: the one is, never to go for any respect from that that he hath promised to be—a professor of Christ's Word and setter-forth of the same to his power; the next, always to show himself an obedient subject to his sovereign, as far as in duty and conscience he is bound; the third, never to alter from that promise he hath made for the maintenance of peace and amity between both the realms."—Wright's *Queen Elizabeth*, i. 115. Thus Knox seems to have transacted a good deal of business at this Sunday supper, and to have laid as fast a hold as words could take on a very slippery person—the head of the house of Hamilton.

² *Diary*, 60.

“On this manner departed this man of God, the light of Scotland, the comfort of the Kirk within the same, the mirror of godliness, and patron and example to all true ministers in purity of life, soundness in doctrine, and in boldness of reproof of wickedness ; and one that cared not the favour of men, how great soever they were, to reprove their abuses and sins.

“In him was such a mighty spirit of judgment and wisdom, that the trouble never came to the Kirk sin his entering on pulpit-preaching but he foresaw the end thereof, so that he had ever ready a new counsel and a faithful to teach men that would be taught to take the best and leave the worst ; so that he that followed his counsel in the end had ever occasion never to repent him ; and contrarie, such as have rejected the same have casten themselves in most shameful wickedness and have come in a part, and daily more and more are like to come and fall to a most miserable ruin, both of soul and bodie—whilk undoubtedly shall come upon them if repentance prevent not God’s judgments—as may be well verified this day in the Hamiltons, the Laird of Grange, and William Maitland, whose end behauld when it comes.”¹

Nearly at the same time with the departure of Knox the country was stirred by another historical death. The Regent Mar died a natural death on the 28th of October. The event was momentous, less by the person it removed than for him it brought upon the political stage.

¹ Memorials, 289.

CHAPTER LV.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

ELECTION OF A NEW REGENT—MORTON CHOSEN—HIS DEALING WITH NORTHUMBERLAND—INFLUENCE IN SCOTLAND OF THE MASSACRE OF ST BARTHOLOMEW—LESLIE, BISHOP OF ROSS—HIS DEFENCE OF QUEEN MARY—ACTS AS HER AMBASSADOR IN ENGLAND—THE POLITICAL RELATION WHICH GAVE HIS MISSION THE STYLE OF AN EMBASSY—MORTON CALLED TO LONDON—THE DIPLOMATIC FARCE PERFORMED THERE—TALK OF THE MARRIAGE OF MARY AND THE DUKE OF ANJOU—PLOTS OF THE BISHOP OF ROSS AND RUDOLPHI—DIFFICULTIES WITH THE BISHOP AS AN AMBASSADOR—THE POPE'S BULL AGAINST QUEEN ELIZABETH—JOINT INFLUENCE OF THE PLOT AND THE MASSACRE IN ENGLAND—PRESSURE FOR PUTTING QUEEN MARY TO DEATH—QUESTION OF A PLAN FOR SENDING HER TO SCOTLAND TO BE SLAIN—KILLIGREW'S MISSION—THE OLD QUEEN'S PARTY DRAWN OFF—GRANGE AND LETHINGTON LEFT.

IN November there was a large meeting of the Estates to elect a new Regent. Again the business was transacted with deliberate formality: "And first of all agreed that ane is mair convenient to rule and govern in the king's majesty's minority than mair. Secondly, all promised and gave their solemn aiths to obey the person that should happen to be chosen to that rowme. And lastly, the noblemen present gave their aiths that whasoever should happen to be chosen to the said office of regentry should accept the same, and not refuse it." As on the former occasion, the first step was to strike a leet. It was limited to two—James Douglas, Earl of Morton, and Alexander Cunningham, Earl of Glencairn. The second name we may

suppose to have been selected for the mere purpose of form. Morton was declared duly elected, and certain general principles of government were laid down, "to the effect that ane uniform concurrence may be betwixt him and the nobility for the forthsetting of the glory of God and governing the affairs of the commonweal."¹ The election was on the 24th November, but for some time before the death of his predecessor Morton virtually ruled the king's party in Scotland.

Of the English who had sought refuge in Scotland at the dispersal of the northern rebellion, one yet remained, the Earl of Northumberland—the others had been helped over to the Continent. Murray, as we have seen, refused to give up Northumberland. Morton was otherwise minded. He had the captive in his own custody, in the Castle of Lochleven, so that he did not require to compromise the Government in the matter; and before the time when he became regent—on 7th June—he handed over Northumberland to the English authorities. It would appear that two thousand pounds, cash down, formed the consideration for this concession, of which a contemporary says, "The fault was done for some other cause nor we know, to the great shame of this realm, to steal so noble a man, ane prisoner, yea, that came in this realm for safety of his life, wha was soon after his coming to London, headed, quartered, and drawn."² Five days before the transference of Northumberland, Norfolk had been beheaded. Such events, with others of larger and more portentous import elsewhere, were the outward tokens of political forces which were hurrying towards a crisis.

Early in September came news of the massacre of St Bartholomew. This great tragedy belongs to the history not only of France, but of every country in which there was a portion of Protestantism, since it created not only horror and wrath, but personal fear: it was like the first shock of an earthquake—no one knew what was to follow, but all feared the worst. The pulpits throughout

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 78.

² Diurnal of Occurrents, 298.

Scotland resounded with denunciations; and Knox was still alive, with enough of the old spirit in him to let his individual voice be heard in the general storm. All this was unpleasant to Le Croc, the ambassador from France, who was in Edinburgh, and could not but be aware of the execrations heaped on the Court he represented. As Banatyne tells us, he "was not a little discontent because his master the King of France should be thus called a traitor, and a murderer of his own subjects under promise and trust; but especially against John Knox, who had pronounced in his sermon, and had declared the same to the ambassador to tell his master, that the sentence is pronounced in Scotland against that murtherer the King of France; that God's vengeance shall never depart from him nor his house, but that his name shall remain an execration unto the posterities to come, and that nane that shall come of his loins shall enjoy that kingdom in peace and quietness until repentance prevent God's judgments."¹

There seems to have been much excitement about the possibility of any Scotsman, especially any of the Scots guard, having assisted in or countenanced the slaughter. An inquisition was held on the rumour that certain persons who had professed the true faith at home, having gone to France, or other foreign parts, "have declined since syne to idolatry and Papistry, passed to the mass, and now returned within the country, to the great slander of the Kirk." Such persons were to be subjected to severe discipline. We find one of them, a Captain Anstruther, admitting that he had been present at mass, "albeit in his conscience he hated the same as idolatry." He submits to all due penance; "and as to the butchery and massacre at Paris, declares he kept the king's gate at Louvre the time thereof, but passed no farther."²

A proclamation was issued calling a General Assembly by the authority of the king and Council. This was the first occasion on which the Crown is found dictating a course of action to the Protestant Church in Scotland, and

¹ Memorials, 273.

² Book of the Universal Kirk, 458, 459.

on a less exciting occasion it might have been denounced as an Erastian interference. The Assembly was to deliberate on the course to be pursued "in respect to the great murthers and more than beastly cruelty used and put in execution in divers parts in Europe against the true Christians within the same; proceeding, na doubt, out of that unhappy, devilish, and terrible Council of Trent, and pretended not only to be executed in foreign countries, where either their power or treason may avail, but also intended to be prosecute and followed forth with the like greater cruelty—if it were possible—against the true Christians here in this our realm of Scotland, and over al-where else wherever Christ's Evangel is sincerely professed." ¹

The Assembly met on the 20th of October. The meeting is all the more emphatic a testimony to the public feeling, that while every congregation was required to join in the election of a due number of representatives, the sole business of the meeting appears to have been the lifting of their protest about the massacre. A week of prayer and fasting was decreed. With a curious logic often met with in ecclesiastical discussions in Scotland, the fate of the French Huguenots was set down as a judgment for the sins of the Scots gentry, and especially their usage of the clergy. They say: "Because in the reformation of the nobility consists the chief example of the hail country, we crave not only a general reformation of such imperfections as are in them, but also that such vices as in particular shall be given in to them be amended—such as that they be reformed in the wrongous using of the patrimony of the Kirk, applying the same to their particular use, to the great hurt of the ministry, the schools, and poor." The occasion is seized for an investigation to be made by the local Church courts into the lives and conduct of all men; and they are to do discipline in such sort "that wickedness and such heinous crimes that offends the majesty of God may be purged forth of this country."

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 271.

The Assembly's protestation seems more natural to the occasion when it demands the rigid enforcement of the penal laws against Papists. But the most truly important, as pointing to the policy of the future, is the concluding injunction of the protestation in these words :—

“For resisting of the Papists of foreign countries, as well within as without, that my lord regent's grace and nobility shall cause such order, that ane league and confederacie be made with our neighbours of England, and other countries Reformed and professing the true religion, that we and they be joined together in mutual amity and society, to support every ane other, whensoever time or occasion shall serve, for maintenance of religion and resisting the enemies thereof. Likewise that ane solemn band and aith be made by all them that be professors of the Evangel within this realm to join themselves together, and be ready on all occasions to resist the enemies fore-saids ; and if any be's fand negligent therein, he shall be holden for ane false brother, and excommunication to proceed against him.”¹

No one event seems to have done so much, both to the furtherance of the Reformation in Scotland, and casting its peculiar character, as this great tragedy in France. It is from this juncture that we may trace the rise of a popular zeal for the Presbyterian polity. It was an occasion to remember the ties which held the Reformed party in the two countries together. If the fact had been little heeded before, it would now be emphatically stamped on the memory of the Scots Protestants, that the sufferers were those very Huguenots from whom they had taken, with scarcely any variation, their ecclesiastical assemblies and their form of worship. Then the queen who had reigned, and might again reign over them, was believed to be an accomplice in the great crime. Hence, as it was the offensive interference of England that gave the queen's party sufficient strength for action, so it was the massacre of St Bartholomew that was the chief immediate cause of its prostration.

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, i. 253, 254.

To see how this great cause worked itself into practical effect, it will be convenient to turn to England and follow up the sequence of events occurring there which exercised an influence on events in Scotland. The person who was the chief agent in these events was our old acquaintance John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, Queen Mary's zealous agent throughout the conferences at York and London. Although he was a thorough partisan throughout quarrels productive of the deepest hatreds, and was concerned in many desperate and dangerous plots, yet he has had the fortune to receive the commendation of enemies as well as friends, and to hold a popular reputation in history. As he was thus a man of much mark, and had risen to a station only gained in general by men of family influence, there was much inquiry as to which branch of the eminent family of Leslie might be his parent stock. He seems to have belonged to the class holding a dubious but influential position already referred to—the children of affluent priests, whose domestic position was in strict law concubinage, though a certain social tolerance redeemed it from absolute infamy.¹ Knox, in his peculiar jeering fashion, called Leslie “a priest's gite;” and this may be held as almost conclusive, for Knox was far too hard a hitter to cast a reproach which everybody in Scotland would know to be a falsehood.

Intimately connected with his championship of his mistress in other shapes was a paper in defence of Queen Mary's honour, in which he ran atilt with Buchanan, as her accuser, in what might be called “the press” of that period. This may be considered the commencement of a controversy which has not only left recent traces, but still lives—a dreary controversy, at least in its early stages, afflictive to all who have waded through it in the hope of finding either past facts or a practical policy for future guidance. On the one side every monarch is God's special agent upon earth, who is responsible to no one but his Almighty Master; and on the other there is the legal fiction of a contract between monarch and people,

¹ See chap. xxxvii.

with the logical conclusion, that when the monarch broke his obligation in the contract, the people were released from theirs, and might lawfully resist his authority. The inspiration of the one party was drawn from the doctrines of imperial supremacy in the Civil and Canon laws, and that of the other from the fanciful republicanism of the Greek and Latin classics ; while both drew from Scripture what suited them. It was not necessary to Leslie's argument that his mistress should be innocent. It is impossible, indeed, to read his vindication without feeling that he believed her to be guilty. He alludes casually in passing to "this good innocent lady," "whose honour many have gone about to blot and deface in charging her most falsely and unjustly with the death of her late husband ;" but these expressions seem merely matter of etiquette and courtesy, like the terms "gentle lady," "virtuous matron," "gallant soldier," "learned divine," and the like. One sees that the bishop throws his force into the argument, that whatever she was, her subjects were bound to implicit obedience, and prohibited by the most holy of laws from entertaining the question whether she was guilty or not.¹ Here and there a reader might think he detects a hankering for the admission of guilt, as if the author desired an opportunity of pushing his argument to its ultimate conclusion. It was an idea somewhat akin to the plea of the devotees of the apostolic succession, when defending their favourite dogma from assaults founded on the sins of the popes and the profligate life of so many illustrious prelates. The integrity of the descent did not predicate the purity of the medium through which it had passed. Nay, the very foulness of the human clay, as supremely exemplified in the Borgias, through which it passed uncontaminated, only exemplified the strength and vitality of its innate purity.

If we can believe the report of a contemporary, the bishop freely admitted her guilt in familiar talk—nay, would exaggerate it, on the principle on which gun-makers

¹ See the quotation from the defence above, chap. xlviii.

apply a "proof-charge" to their manufacture.¹ If divine right could stand the test of such wickedness, so much the stronger was that principle. The bishop's opinions on government were entirely to the taste of Queen Elizabeth; and she thought none the less of their author, if she saw that he had a hidden belief in her royal sister's guilt. When the conference at Hampton Court was at an end, he remained in England in the quality of ambassador from the Queen of Scots. As Elizabeth had not admitted that Queen Mary had been lawfully removed from the throne, she found that she could not, or at least she would not, deny to the bishop the privileges of ambassador, though it was scarcely consistent that the representative should enjoy the immunities of an ambassador in the country where the sovereign represented was a prisoner. Queen Elizabeth conceded to him cordially the privileges of intercourse practised between sovereigns and the ambassadors of crowned princes in that day, and she repeatedly praised him for his fidelity to his mistress; but she afterwards found that even a believer in the divine right of monarchs could prove dangerous.²

¹ See in Froude (ix. 400) the letter to Burleigh by Sir Thomas Wilson, in which, after citing some remarks by the bishop on the project of the Norfolk marriage, there follows :—

"He saith farther upon speech that I had with him, that the queen his mistress is not fit for any husband; for, first, he saith she poisoned her husband the French king, as he hath credibly understood. Again, she hath consented to the murder of her late husband the Lord Darnley. Thirdly, she matched with the murderer, and brought him to the field to be murdered. And lastly, she pretends marriage with the duke, with whom, as he thinks, she could not long have kept faith, and the duke should not have had the best days with her. Lord, what people are these! what a queen, and what an ambassador!"

² "Although we doubt not but you are well certified of the diligence and care of your ministers having your commission, yet can we not, beside an allowance generally of them, specially note to you your good choice of this bearer, the Bishop of Ross, who hath not only faithfully and wisely, but also so carefully and dutifully, for your honour and weal, behaved himself, and that both privately and publicly, as we cannot but in this sort commend him unto you, as we wish you had many such devoted discreet servants, for in our judgment we think ye have not any in loyalty and faithfulness can overmatch him."—Goodall, ii. 270, 271.

Queen Elizabeth was then in the midst of her grotesque negotiations for a marriage with the young Duke of Anjou. If it really were, as some think, that she was amusing herself with a bold game at coquetry, she was certainly permitted by her sage advisers to do what must, if it had ever revealed itself, have been a stinging insult to one of the proudest and most powerful Courts of Europe. She was thirty-seven, and he was twenty years old. In private circles at the present day such a union would perhaps be censured as "a disparity of ages on the wrong side." Looking at it as a question of State policy, in which all considerations of attachment or other personal matters must be submerged, the bare outlines of history show how momentous such a negotiation might become. In 1574 the Duke of Anjou became Henry III., King of France. The practical political conclusion was the possible balance of France and England against the Pope, the Emperor, and Philip of Spain; and on the other hand the extinction of the plots for uniting Spain and France in a project to place Queen Mary on the throne of England. What place the Huguenot party might hold in France was yet undecided—perhaps they might become supreme. To cultivate and caress them was perhaps part of the preparation of that net in which they were to be caught and slain. It is possible that the alliance with a heretic Queen of England may have been among the lures held out to lead them to destruction. If it has been thought that Elizabeth was on the eve of sacrificing her public political duty to the feelings inspired by an ever-present attraction, surely it would be a terrible fall from that lofty self-command for which she has been so widely renowned, if she were to throw all these momentous interests into a coquettish game of "would and would not" with a youth whom she had never seen.

However it was, England and France were in close diplomatic concord; and as Mary's name was not struck off the list of queens at the English Court, her ambassador transacted business with the other two. France was friendly in her cause, if not very earnest; and England must go along with France, or have a quarrel. So it happened that

the restoration of Queen Mary to her throne, under certain sound conditions, came to be on paper a matter of solemn diplomacy. The remembrance of this will explain many anomalies, and render it unnecessary to suppose that Queen Elizabeth not only veered between the king's and the queen's party in Scotland, in obedience to her own womanly caprice, but that on each occasion she brought round her sage advisers with her. These advisers found it necessary to have all things ready for striking a final blow against Queen Mary in Scotland, while it was necessary in the mean time to discuss with France the terms of her restoration. After some preliminaries, certain specific articles were exchanged between the high contracting parties, the Queen of England and the Queen of Scots. It is unnecessary to burden history with stipulations which not only came to no practical issue, but were not matter of public knowledge in their day, and were perhaps to those concerned only a solemn mockery. But there is one little point on which Queen Mary showed that the old spirit was not dead. The articles were prepared by Cecil and Mildmay, and sent for the criticism of Queen Mary and her faithful ambassador. One condition was, that Queen Mary was to ratify that treaty of Edinburgh which acknowledged that Elizabeth was the lawful Queen of England,—a concession which, as we have seen, Mary had, through all her difficulties and humiliations, ever managed to evade. The condition in the original draft was,—

“That besides the general contract of amity, the Queen of Scots shall by special words confirm the clause of the last treaty of Edinburgh, in the month of July 1560, or the true meaning thereof, for her forbearing from all manner of title, challenges, or pretences to the crown of England, whilst the queen's majesty and any issue to come of her body shall live and have continuance; with provision to the Queen of Scots, that thereby she shall not be secluded from any right or title that she and her children may hereafter have, if God shall not give to the queen's majesty any issue of her body to have continuance.”

The words “any issue to come” were intended to be

comprehensive; but they were unfortunate, in giving such an opportunity for inflicting a feminine sting as Mary could not forego. She suggested a trifling alteration—merely that the word “lawful” be inserted before the word “issue.” This was an amendment that could not be well rejected, and Cecil was content to note on the margin that it was offered “with no good and honourable meaning.”¹

The worthy French ambassador, La Mothe Fénelon, stirred himself not only to keep this project alive, but to bring it to a practical conclusion. Pitcairn, the Comendator of Dunfermline, was resident ambassador, or rather agent, for the king's party in London. His instructions were to represent the King of Scots, and of course he had no power to treat for the restitution of the king's mother. Queen Elizabeth desired that a deputation from the ruling party, a deputation of men entitled to represent them, should attend in London, and sent Pitcairn back to say so. We have seen that when she acknowledged the king's Government as an existing fact on the election of Lennox to the regency, she had reserved the possibility of doing something for Queen Mary if she got new lights on the merits of her case, and now she threatened to take

¹ “Articles delivered to the Queen of Scots by Sir William Cecil and Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer, councillors and commissioners to the queen's majesty of England, with the Queen of Scots' answers and requests thereto, 5th October 1570;” Haynes's State Papers, 608. See also original documents cited, Froude, x. 126.

This is not the only instance where the draftsmen of the State documents of the period gave opportunity for spiteful comments on the same topic. In the Act of 1571 against seditious practices, the penalties are incurred “if any one during the queen's life should by any book written or printed expressly maintain that any person is or ought to be the queen's heir or successor, except the natural issue of her body.” Camden, following up a thoroughly distinct exposition of the meaning given by the common-lawyer to the concluding words, says: “So that I myself, being then a young man, have often heard people say that this word was inserted into the Act by Leicester, with a design that one time or other he might impose some bastard son of his upon the English for the queen's *natural* issue.”—Camden in Carte, ii. 436.

a broad view of that reservation. The affair seemed so menacing that Morton took the mission into his own hand, though the time was extremely critical and he could ill be spared. He was accompanied by Macgill and Pitcairn. It seemed to be the old story of the conferences over again. They were not called traitors and rebels, but still they had to plead before Queen Elizabeth the cause of the new Government, and to justify their conduct.

They left Scotland at the end of February, and did not return again until the 18th of April. The conferences in which they shared were deemed momentous in England and France, and were discussed in every Court in Europe. But so busy were the Scots with their own immediate affairs, that no contemporary writer save Buchanan gives an account of a discussion appearing on its face to involve the future fate of Scotland. It is scarcely even noticed that the truce was adjusted to facilitate the conference. It is simply stated that Morton and his companions returned after an absence on business in England. Fénélon watched their arrival with impatience, and immediately entered on friendly conference with them. The treaty between the Queen of England and the Queen of Scots contained a stipulation for placing the young prince under the protection of Queen Elizabeth. To this his mother had consented under certain conditions; but the French Government were alarmed by the proposal, as likely to close for ever their influence over Scotland. Fénélon therefore met Morton with two propositions, which he was bound to press: the one, that the young prince would not be handed over to the Queen of England; the other, that he and those who acted with him should return to their duty and allegiance to their queen. On the first, Morton gave an assurance prompt and absolute—there was no danger of their giving up their king. On the second, he spoke about the danger to himself and others if the queen came back; and he declined to accept of the assurances of the King of France for his safety. By no persuasions, promises, or threats, could Fénélon, according to his own account, get satisfaction on this point; and we can imagine him more than ever calling up the dangerous

smile which was known on occasion to lighten up the rigid features of Morton's face. Fénelon heard that Queen Elizabeth in Council was strongly pressed on the exceeding danger to herself and her realm of giving effect to the restoration project. She said that was not what she called them to consult about. It was a thing determined on. What she desired was, that they would settle with the commissioners from Scotland the method of effecting it. When this was brought to Morton, it seems to have roused him to say what would at once put an end to farther dubious talk, and bring action if it was to come. He spoke once, and again still more emphatically and angrily, to the following effect: Their queen had resigned the crown, and the resignation had been accepted and dealt with by the Estates. By the constitution of Scotland these were supreme. Their queen had committed great crimes, and they had resolved that she should no longer reign over them. Scotland had punished evil sovereigns before: it was a wholesome practice, warranted by Scripture which gave examples of the punishment of wicked kings, and conformable to the privileges of a free nation. At the conference at York the reasons for the act had been sufficiently set forth in the proved guilt of the queen. But, right or wrong, it was a thing with which England had no concern. It was done; and whether they had assistance from England or not, they felt themselves strong enough to fight their own battle.¹

¹ The only contemporaneous Scots account of Morton's defiance is in Buchanan. The account of it by Calderwood is little more than a translation of Buchanan's. He calls it the "summa" or summary of his mission rendered by Morton on his return to the Parliament at Stirling. But we may suspect that it is rather Buchanan's expansion than Morton's Abridgment. It touched on the historian's favourite theme; and it is impossible to believe that Morton, who was a man rather of action than of words, could have uttered the eloquent essay on classical republicanism—eloquent, yet tedious to the modern reader—of which Buchanan gives him the merit. If an abridgment of anything, it might rather be of Buchanan's own essay, 'De Jure Regni,' than of any speeches of Morton's. One might believe the whole to be the invention of the historian, were not the tenor of it in great measure confirmed by the reports

When this tirade of political blasphemy was carried to Elizabeth, it brought on one of her paroxysms of fury. She could not well punish Morton, and she seemed inclined, after the manner of Eastern despots, to take vengeance on those who brought her the report. She said the advice to speak in such fashion had been given him by some of her own Council, who deserved to be hanged, with a cartel of their advice round their necks. Queen Mary, or the Bishop of Ross for her, suggested that Morton should be detained in England, evidently that he might be punished for his offences; and Elizabeth so far showed a hankering in the same direction by forbidding his immediate return. The discussion was kept alive by various proposals and incidents. Among them, news came how Walsingham had discovered in Paris an arrangement for the marriage of Queen Mary to the Duke of Anjou, to whom it was said she had indorsed her claim to the throne of England.¹ It was put to the Bishop of Ross,

which Fénélon rendered to his own Court, evidently shuddering under the task of repeating such perilous stuff.

¹ The Bishop of Ross, among the articles which he says the English Council or "the principal councillors" desired that he should propose to his mistress as the basis of a settlement, one was, "That a renunciation be procured by the Queen of Scots of a title which the Duke of Anjou pretended to the crown of England, by virtue of assignation made to him by the Queen of Scots, in hope of a marriage to be contracted betwixt them."—*Leslie's Negotiations*; Anderson, iii. 50. The bishop's account of the answer rendered by his mistress to this requisition is a strange one: "She would procure a declaration and renunciation of the Duke of Anjou of the alleged title, although there was never any such thing done by her in his favours, as she affirmed upon her princely word, conscience, and honour."—*Ibid.*, 53. This is thoroughly in character with poor Leslie's tone throughout: it is that of a man who never can be sure of what his mistress may have done, whatever she may have said to him or others, and who consequently thinks it necessary to provide for the possibility of the fact being the reverse of what she tells him. He says afterwards, that James Borthwick was to be sent to France to know what the French king thought of the Norfolk marriage, and the effect it would have on the relations of Scotland, with England on the one hand, and France on the other; and at the same time "to procure and obtain such things as was necessarily required, especially the renunciation of the Duke of Anjou."—*Ibid.*, 54.

that he might end all the strife and difficulty by at once clearing his mistress of the foul charges made against her. But the bishop, as we have seen, took refuge from such a perilous duty in very high reasons of political philosophy. It was not a sentiment to have place even in human thought, far less in practice, that a sovereign accountable only to God should be required to vindicate herself from charges made by her own subjects. On her part the French king was pressed either to abandon his opposition to the placing of her son in England, or else that he would send a force for her restoration. Whatever shape the discussion took, broad or narrow, Morton asserted that he had no powers to consent to anything affecting his king's authority; and when pressed hard he protested and swore that so it was. This determination forced a way out of the immediate difficulty—he should return for fresh powers. He was glad to return; but the fresh powers in the direction indicated were not in his thoughts, and even the sanguine Fénelon saw at this stage that nothing was to be done for the Queen of Scots, to whom he had a friendly attachment.¹

It was about a month after this, on the 13th of May, that the Bishop of Ross received a visit from three English statesmen—Lord Sussex, Sir Ralph Sadler, and Sir Walter Mildmay. The bishop was acknowledged as an ambassador, and to send officers of the law to deal with him would have been an indecorum and a breach of diplomatic rule. Virtually, however, the three distinguished visitors were detective policemen. The result of their visit was, that he was to reside with his brother bishop of Ely in his house in Holborn, and this was a decorous committal to prison. He had long held secret transactions with a certain Rudolphi, an emissary of the Pope, who kept close communication not only with his holiness, but with Philip of Spain and his great captain the Duke of Alva.

Rudolphi had been many years in England conducting the business of a banker. Suspicion against him first

¹ Correspondence diplomatique de Bertrand, de Salignac, de la Mothe Fénelon, iii. 2 *et seq.*

arose out of dealings with the rebel lords of the north. On this point he was at once explicit and candid. In his trade as a banker he looked solely to the security of his moneys and the interest payable, and no ways concerned himself with the purpose to which the borrower was to apply the loan. With the bishop, however, who by his own account had been despoiled of his "rents, houses, and possessions, and lived for three years in penury," heavy banking transactions could not well be on his own account. If these were his business with Rudolphi, the transactions must affect his mistress's French dowry, and all dealings with that were matters of moment to the English Government. It turned out in reality that the bishop's dealings were far deeper and broader. He had previously been so far suspected that he had been placed in seclusion four months in the Bishop of London's palace: that was at the time of the English expedition into Scotland under Sussex. The connection with Rudolphi was still a secret. The banker himself had been signally fortunate in his explanations. He was a man of birth; and being a Florentine, his profession of a banker did not derogate from that, or preclude him from the society of men of his rank. Noble, acquainted with affairs and languages, believed to be candid and upright, he was chosen by Cecil and Walsingham as a person who might be sent to the Court of King Philip to adjust some business about prizes at sea, and pecuniary claims connected with them. It seemed a fortunate accident for the bishop. He furnished Rudolphi with full instructions, both from Queen Mary and from Norfolk. He triumphed so far as to put the emissary in possession of Norfolk's signature, whom he thus committed to the great project on hand.

This project was distinct and comprehensive. There was to be a landing either at Harwich or Portsmouth. "From his majesty [the King of Spain] and his holiness we ask for 6000 harquebusmen, with 4000 additional harquebuses to arm our own people, 2000 corselets, and 25 pieces of artillery. 3000 horses will be wanted also, to keep command of the country in case the Queen of England make more resistance than it is thought she will

be able to do." Money will be wanted, which Queen Mary and Norfolk are to reimburse when, with the help of God and his majesty, they are successful. If the invading force could be increased to ten thousand—two thousand being sent to Scotland, and the like number to Ireland—this would be an improvement. As the scheme resolved itself into practical detail, it included the landing of two thousand men at Aberdeen, where Huntly would be found in possession for Queen Mary, and a united army of Scots and Spaniards would be prepared to march southwards.¹ The bishop was in the thick of these splendid projects even while the conference with Fénélon and Morton seemed to keep his hands full of business at home; and he carefully adjusted the arrangements for seizing the Queen of England and releasing his own mistress.

An accident opened up the whole plot to Cecil, as with the rising of the curtain in a play. Rudolphi placed confidence in a certain Charles Bailey described as a Fleming. He knew a great deal, and he was the bearer of three instructive letters in cipher—one to Norfolk, one to Lord Lumley, and one to the bishop. The messenger had also a bundle of copies of the bishop's *Vindication of Queen Mary*, printed abroad. This was a commodity not likely to save him from any interruption or suspicion to which he might otherwise be liable. The bishop complained that the messenger had disobeyed orders. He was told to leave his charge in assured hands at Calais, to be afterwards brought over. He brought them himself to Dover, where he was seized and searched. The bishop's marvellous adroitness all but remedied the blunder of his messenger. By a feat which partook almost as much of jugglery as of diplomacy, he got the fatal packet addressed to himself into his hands, and laid down another in its place, outwardly an exact imitation, but containing nothing within betraying more than honest zeal in the cause of his mistress. But suspicion was roused. He had no occasion to be then in London, for the conference for which he went thither was over. The

¹ Froude, x. 169, 203.

agent who conveyed the packet to Norfolk was the bishop's man. Through that agent there was a possible clue to all the mystery, and through all shapes of harshness and cruelty it was followed. The bishop took to bed for three months, grievously afflicted with "the burning ague." He acknowledged that for thirty years he had not known sickness, but the anxiety of this crisis was too much even for his Scots constitution. It was while he was in his own estimation utterly unfit to be spoken to that his privacy was invaded by the distinguished visitors already referred to. He had energy enough at his command to baffle and defy them. He would answer no questions, saying he was an ambassador who would give no information to any one but his own queen who had commissioned him; and as to the information they professed to have extracted from Bailey, "if Rudolphi had told him any such matters," it appeared to him that it was "but an Italian discourse, and of no moment, not to be taken heed unto." They searched the premises, of course with no result; they found nothing but what was proper and orderly. They desired to see his man Cuthbert; but Cuthbert knew a great deal too much, and therefore the bishop, before falling into the burning ague, had sent him off, "to be surely and secretly kept by the means of assured friends four months thereafter in London, until means were taken for his removal to France."

Continuing to press his privilege as an ambassador, he was told that the opinion of counsel had been taken fully on that point, with the conclusion that ambassadors forfeited all privileges if they either conspired or openly acted against the government to which they were accredited. He answered rather ingeniously, that England had not laid on herself the restraint of this rule; in Scotland especially, where there had been a rebellious attempt against the queen and her husband Darnley just after their marriage, the English ambassador had assisted and encouraged the rebels. But the moral of this precedent was inverted by success. The party aided by the English ambassador was now dominant in Scotland.

According to his own story, "In the end the lords said, 'We perceive you will make no other answer, and therefore you must be handled accordingly; and first shall be sent to the Tower to close prison, where the pinches or racks will cause you tell another tale; and lastly, you shall be made example to all other Papists or false Scots to attempt the like in time to come.'" At the Tower he was "placed in a prison called the Bloody Tower—a very evil-aired and infected house, where no man of honest calling had been kept many years before, with close windows, and doors with many locks and bolts, which were torment sufficient enough for any living man that had been all his days at liberty."

Meanwhile the searching of the Duke of Norfolk's house produced an affluent prize in explanatory documents. A message was brought to the bishop, on the part of Queen Elizabeth, that all was known; that the heads of the conspiracy, all then in the Tower with himself, had uttered and subscribed full confessions, which would be read over to him if he desired. If he also would make a clean breast, it could injure no one, and would be all the better for himself and his mistress. The queen considered that there were practices which might be passed over in his case, "considering sundry things that might have moved him thereto that her own subjects could not pretend for their excuse." It was a mild offer, influenced apparently by Elizabeth's sympathy with his devotion to his mistress. On the other hand, if he refused to speak out, he should be dealt with as if he had been a native Englishman, and put on trial for treason. He made an explanation, which he dexterously limited to the facts confessed or testified by others; and according to the promise made, he was permitted to depart in peace, nourishing the suspicion that this liberal usage was entirely designed to gain him over to Queen Elizabeth, and induce him to make further revelations.

A few days after Norfolk was beheaded, certain eminent persons—Lord Delaware, Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir Thomas Wilson, and Thomas Bromley—were sent to Queen Mary, as we are told, "to expostulate with her by way of accusa-

tion." Camden gives the purport of their expostulation, and it may suffice for a clear and compendious abridgment of the whole case against her as plotting mischief to the existing Government of England: "That she had usurped the title and court of the crown of England, and had not renounced the same, as was agreed upon in the treaty of Edinburgh. That for the full possessing herself thereof she had treated of a marriage with the Duke of Norfolk without acquainting the queen therewith; for the consummation whereof, and for freeing the duke out of the Tower by force of arms, she had used all methods possible by her ministers. That she had raised a rebellion in the north; relieved notorious rebels in Scotland and Flanders; petitioned for a foreign aid from the Pope, the Spaniards, and others, by Rudolphi, an Italian, in order to invade England; and conspired with certain of the English who should free her out of prison, and declare her Queen of England. That she had received letters from the Pope, wherein he promised to cherish her as a hen does her chickens, and to esteem them true sons of the Church who should stand by her. Lastly, that she had procured the Pope's bull against the queen, and permitted her party in foreign parts to style her publicly Queen of England."¹

The "Pope's bull" was that act of excommunication which, to the horror, astonishment, and wrath of Protestant London, was found attached to the gate of their bishop's palace by some audacious unknown hand, like the mysterious citations of the old secret tribunals. With a protestation that she was "an absolute sovereign," and not bound to answer questions, Mary gave a denial to each article. On the assumption of the arms of England, and the never ratifying the treaty of Edinburgh, she said it was her husband, the King of France, not she, who had assumed the arms; and "that she had neither borne them since her husband's death, nor would challenge them as long as Queen Elizabeth or her children lived." This was exquisitely in keeping with her subtle policy on this

¹ Kennet, ii. 442.

matter. She will not do an act personally offensive to her royal sister or her royal sister's children. But she commits herself to no admission of Queen Elizabeth's title. It is one of the strongest examples of the united subtlety and tenacity of Queen Mary's character, that through all her trials and difficulties she never admitted, either under her hand or in any formal shape, that Elizabeth was the rightful Queen of England. It was a corollary to this, that she gave no occasion to the foreign potentates—to the Pope and King Philip especially—to act as if she no longer claimed the crown of England as her own.

Looking to the other queen, it is interesting to observe, that for all the desperate plotting of which the Bishop of Ross was the master, he commended himself still to her by his devotion to her enemy. It seemed almost as if Queen Elizabeth had felt the want of such devotion to herself. Afterwards, when the Castle of Edinburgh was rendered, Morton, becoming supreme in Scotland, demanded that the bishop should be handed over, to be dealt with by him as a traitor. Queen Elizabeth's answer was: "He hath been an evil counsellor and doer in divers things here in this our realm, both against us and that realm also; yet he hath also opened so frankly and sincerely those evil dealings and counsel whereof he was privy and party, and did afterwards appear to be wholly true, and bereft by others, that we cannot well condescend to deliver him to any extremity; but we rather wish that you would be content to let him enjoy such benefit and grace at your hands as others hath obtained, and that you would suffer him to have his living again in Scotland, as you have done to others, if he shall submit and conform himself to your good orders, as others have done who were as great enemies and offenders as he."¹

When a few months later the whole island was ringing with the news of the great tragedy in Paris, it was natural that in England at least it should be at once connected with the revelations of the Rudolphi affair. A sudden

¹ Hopetoun MS.

blow was to be struck against the new Church—such was the tenor of the revelations; and far from exempting England, these revelations made that country the chosen theatre of the performance. When the projects so plotted in secrecy came suddenly into action in Paris, this was naturally set down as the opening scene of the great tragedy; the others might come in London, in Edinburgh, wherever the new faith had existence and could be extirpated.¹ For eight years the Catholic powers had been organising the plan; and Queen Mary was one of the chief plotters, having for her colleagues the Pope, Philip of Spain, and Catherine of Medici—such was the belief of the Protestant world, and the mysterious meeting at Bayonne gave it place and circumstance. As we have seen, rumour was wrong, since Catherine of Medici did not think the course proposed a prudent one; but what she had now done justified the conclusion that the blow struck at Paris in 1572 had been planned at Bayonne in 1565. For these rumours and terrors there was so far a foundation in the existence of those elements of combination, whence grew up the formidable Catholic league which threatened to drive the house of Valois from the throne as not sufficiently zealous for the Popedom. Hence at this juncture the acts of every Protestant community must be interpreted as done under a reign of terror. It is apparent through all the diplomacy and

¹ The chief printed authorities for the story of Rudolphi and the Bishop of Ross will be found in the bishop's own account "of his whole charge and proceedings during the time of his embassy, from his entries in England on September 1568, to the 26th of March 1572," Anderson's Collection, vol. iii.; in the early part of Murdin's State Papers; and in the trial of the Duke of Norfolk, State Trials, i. 958. Connected as it is with Norfolk's treason and the rebellion of the northern lords, the affair belongs much more to English than to Scots history. No attempt has therefore been here made to do more than merely to sketch the bishop's part in the business, as connected with the projects in favour of Queen Mary, and incidental to the events presently afterwards occurring in Scotland. For a full tracing of the affair through its dark complexities, reference must be made to the picturesque narrative in Mr Froude's tenth volume, enriched and completed as it is by contributions from foreign manuscripts.

government action of the period, that when a strong step is necessary, the preamble or justification for it is a reference to the dangers of the times.

It was especially under the influence of this feeling that early in September, and close on the reception of the news about the massacre, Henry Killigrew was sent to Scotland. He was to represent "that the bloody massacre of Paris was executed by the joint contrivance of the Pope, the French king, and the Spanyard, for the utter extirpation of the Protestants." He was to warn both parties to expect a force under Strozzi, and a contest with foreigners, the end of which would be pleasant to neither of them.¹ Along with this open mission, in which he was to deal with all parties, another duty of a more mysterious character was committed to Killigrew; it concerned the dealing with the Queen of Scots, and demands a little introductory explanation. On the occasion of the great revelations, the English Parliament had attempted to solve this difficulty. On the 12th of May the journals bear that a Committee of the Lords was appointed to hold a joint conference with certain members of the Commons "for the more speedy and better direction of them in the great matter touching the Queen of Scots." On the proceedings of both Houses, too, it is to be traced that a bill had passed them "touching Mary, daughter and heir of James V., late King of Scotland, commonly called the Queen of Scots;" but as no further traces are to be found of such a measure, it has been supposed that Queen Elizabeth desired that it might drop, and not be brought up for the royal assent. According to Camden, the purport of it was, "that if the Queen of Scots should again offend against the laws of England, she should be proceeded against by law as if she were the wife of an English peer."² Convocation discussed the question; and a deputation of bishops attended the queen, exhorting her to do justice on the common adversary, though they do not seem to have suggested the form in which it

¹ Camden in Kennet, ii. 448.

² Parl. Hist., i. 779; Camden in Kennet, i. 436.

was to be accomplished.¹ Elizabeth's determination seems to have been, that as she had protected the fugitive queen from the fate awaiting her in Scotland, she should protect her no longer. Secret instructions were given to Killigrew, with the usual preamble about "the late horrible universal murder in France." According to Queen Elizabeth's usual formula, he was to act in this matter "as from himself," and was even to go a step further, and get the action "from himself" prompted by the other party. He was to say that if they made an earnest appeal to the English Council, "there was some likelihood to think" that in the present juncture of affairs Queen Mary might be delivered up to them.

"It is found daily more and more that the continuance of the Queen of Scots here is so dangerous, both for the person of the queen's majesty and for her State and realm, as nothing presently is more necessary than that the realm might be delivered of her; and though by justice this might be done in this realm, yet for certain respects it seemeth better that she be sent into Scotland, to be delivered to the regent and his party, so as it may be by some good means wrought that they themselves would secretly require it, and that good assurance may be given, that as they have heretofore many times, specially in the time of the queen's former regents, offered, so they would without fail proceed with her by way of justice, so as neither that realm nor this should be endangered by her hereafter, for otherwise to have her and to keep her were of all other most dangerous."²

That there was a treaty for removing Queen Mary to Scotland, and that if in terms of such a treaty she had been put into the hands of the regent, she would not have been permitted long to live, are two propositions which may safely be inferred from documents already commented upon. A further conclusion has been drawn, that she was to be secretly put to death. This has, however, only been reached by inference from dubious sentences in the correspondence. Whenever its announcements are distinct,

¹ Froude, x. 360.

² Murdin's State Papers, 224, 225.

they point to a public trial. Among the mysteries, there is, for instance, a passage about hostages which sounds strangely. On the supposition of an application being made by the Scots Government, the anticipated result is, that "it might at this time better than any time heretofore be brought to pass they might have her, so as there might be good surety given that she might receive that she hath deserved there by order of justice, whereby no farther peril should ensue by her escaping, or by setting her up again. For otherwise you may well say that the Council of England will never assent to deliver her out of the realm; and for assurance none can suffice but hostages of good value—that is, some children or near kinsfolks of the regent and the Earl Morton."¹

If this condition as to hostages pointed to the supposed conclusion, its meaning would be, that if the Scots failed to put Queen Mary to death, Queen Elizabeth might put the hostages to death; and the question just comes to be, whether such an alternative was not something too preposterous and indecorous even for that age? One passage in the correspondence of the ambassador has been supposed to point distinctly at assassination because the word "secret" occurs in it. The ambassador tells how, on a meeting with the regent and Morton at Dalkeith, "the Earl of Morton raised himself in bed, and said that both my lord regent and he did desire it as a sovereign salve for all their sores; howbeit it could not be done without some manner of ceremony, and a kind of process, whereunto the noblemen must be called after a secret manner, and the clergy likewise, which would ask some time."

Whether secretly convoked or not, an assemblage such as this refers to would be unusual tools for the accomplishment of a secret assassination; and the remainder of the correspondence shows that the extent of the "secret" dealing was, that "the great matter" was not to be the ostensible reason for assembling the Estates. Speaking of the regent, Killigrew concludes: "Thus took I my leave of him, and find him indeed more cold than Morton. The Parliament,

¹ Murdin's State Papers, 225.

some think, may be called upon a sudden, and as it were for some other cause, ere they can proceed by order of justice ; for although she be condemned as worthy of her demission, and art and part, as they termed it, of the murther of her husband, yet was she not judged to die for the same. Whether this be an excuse to delay time I leave your honour to judge. But sure I am that most part of the nobility, and all the burrows and ministers, would be right glad of it.”¹

Nothing is said of this project in contemporary narratives, and in the correspondence that has come down to us it dies away. How the arrangements about it came to nought is as difficult to tell as what they actually were. It may only be inferred from the tone of the correspondence that Queen Elizabeth thought there was too much fuss and publicity about the execution of the project, and too little of that doing things as “from themselves” which she liked so well in her friends and her servants.

Killigrew was very successful in his ostensible mission. He brought the Hamiltons and the old queen's party to terms. Of the Hamiltons, both the head and heart had gone with the archbishop. The duke was now an old man ; in his early prime he had almost made a reputation by the power of his inertness, and now he was dwindling into oblivion. There can have been little difficulty with Huntly, Argyle, and the other members of the old queen's party ; they seem to have been stricken and unnerved by the horrors of the news from Paris, just as their opponents were strung to exertion by them. Huntly was the last to come to terms. On the 27th of February 1583, we are told that he “hasted home to stay his brother”—that is to say, to check the destructive career of his brother, who

¹ Cotton MS., Caligula, c. iii. 373. The concluding passage in this document creates some verbal confusion by putting the person to be dealt with in the male sex : “Also that it would be requisite her majesty should send such a convoy with the party, that in case there were people would not like of it, they might be able to keep the field ; adding further, that if they can get the nobility to consent, as they hope they shall, they will not keep the prisoner three hours alive after he come into the bounds of Scotland.”

had just been harrying the Frasers and Forbeses ; and this was the conclusion of the old Queen's party.¹ It thus came to pass that by her handiwork on that day of St Bartholomew, the Florentine woman accomplished an object which probably she did not foresee—the ruin of that queen whom she had so hated as her son's wife.

By a strange combination of events, the only body now determined to stand by Queen Mary were those who, led by the late converts to her cause—Lethington and Grange—occupied the narrow portion of her old dominion, on the top of the castle rock of Edinburgh. In vain they were summoned to surrender, and appealed to by Drury, the regent, and some of their deserting allies of the queen's party. As there was scarcely now a queen's party, a name had to be found for this isolated body, and they were called "the Castilians."

Lethington was still the great inscrutable ; but Grange's motives admit of a simple and sad solution. It was all over with him and his great project ; he must have seen that it was a mighty blunder. In the wreck he had made, some possessions not worthless still remained to him—his bravery and his endurance. If he could no longer use these qualities for the benefit of his country, or even for the hopeful furtherance of his newly-adopted cause, yet they might be available for a purpose of his own—they might in some measure be so used as to preserve his name from infamy. He had turned against the cause in which he had embarked, the very weapons put into his hands for its defence. He would now prove that his fall came not from treachery of nature, but from conviction and conversion—at the worst, from waywardness. And so he chose his part. He was so placed, that had he readily accepted the offer of reconciliation, he must have lost the last rag that covered his name from infamy. To the Hamiltons, Huntly, Maxwell, and all the others who had been steady friends to the queen's cause, there was an honourable escape from their evil position, but none for him.

¹ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 527, 528.

CHAPTER LVI.

REGENCY OF MORTON.

(Continued.)

END OF THE TRUCE, AND RECOMMENCEMENT OF THE WAR—LETHINGTON AND GRANGE IN THE CASTLE OF EDINBURGH—A PARLIAMENT IN THE TOWN—ENGLAND COMMITTED TO THE KING'S PARTY, AND AID SENT—THE SIEGE OF THE CASTLE—THE CAPTURE AND DESTRUCTION—FATE OF GRANGE—THE STORY OF KNOX'S PROPHECIES—LETHINGTON'S END—MORTON, AND THE COMPLETION OF HIS POWER—QUIETNESS IN THE COUNTRY—THE YOUNG KING—HIS TRAINING AND HIS TEACHERS—BUCHANAN AND YOUNG—BUCHANAN'S PROJECTS FOR THE REARING OF A PERFECT MONARCH—THEIR RESULT—MORTON AND ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS—CONDITIONS OF THE RETENTION OF THE OLD HIERARCHY—THE HUGUENOT AND THE PURITAN INFLUENCES—JOHN CRAIG—ANDREW MELVILLE.

THE truce or abstinence, which was at first to last for two months from the 1st of August, was continued by short additions to the end of the year, when the war again began while Killigrew was bringing his negotiations with the queen's party to a conclusion. As a minute journalist of the time tells us, "Upon the 1st day of January, at six hours in the morning, there was a piece of ordnance shot off the castle wall in warning that truce was outrun and given up."¹ Thus bravely Grange took the initiative. The contest was to recommence under conditions very different from those in which it had been suspended. The

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 323.

castle was then the citadel of a fortified town under the command of its governor. If parties had stood as they then were, the truce would not have been of equal influence to both, since the town of Edinburgh was opened to the king's party, those citizens who had been driven forth having returned to their homes. But after the surrender of the old queen's party, this was of no moment; for Grange's garrison hardly sufficed to man the castle, and he could not have attempted to hold the town.

Grange's guns did much mischief among the buildings within their range; but it was significant of his waning strength that the king's party held a Parliament close at hand. Before the truce, as we have seen, the Estates felt it prudent to abandon the suburb of the Canongate; but now they met in safety in the Tolbooth, finding a passage safe from the reach of the guns through that Church of St Giles which their enemies had fortified and garrisoned. The Estates assembled in the middle of February. The "honours," as we have seen, were in possession of the Castilians, who were called on to render them up, but naturally refused to do so. The Estates, however, continued to assume the external semblance of their old pomp. Angus carried the crown, Argyle the sceptre, and Morton the sword; but we are told that these symbols "were made of brass, and double overgilt with gold, because the principal jewels were in the Castle of Edinburgh, and might not be had."¹ The proceedings of this Parliament related chiefly to ecclesiastical matters to be dealt with farther on. An Act of Indemnity was passed for the security of those of the queen's party who had conformed, naming especially the Earls of Argyle, Eglinton, and Cassilis, and the Lords Boyd, Maxwell, and Herries. By another statute the property of all citizens who had remained in Edinburgh during the war as adherents of the queen was made convertible into a fund for indemnifying the citizens of the king's party who had suffered loss by the destruction of their houses or in other shapes.² The minor casualties of war told against the castle party.

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 324.

² Act. Parl., iii. 74 *et seq.*

The grudging aid sent to them by France was intercepted. It was in two vessels, one of them containing a considerable sum paid to the account of Queen Mary's French dower. It was commanded by Grange's brother, James Kirkcaldy, who was to land with it under the protection of the fortress of Blackness, on the south shore of the Firth of Forth. When he reached that spot, however, he found that instead of being received and protected in a friendly fortress he had stepped into a hostile prison. The story of the day was, that he was caught in a trap cleverly laid by James Balfour. This deep and versatile plotter, called by Principal Robertson "the most corrupt man of his day," had, as we have seen, been dislodged from Edinburgh Castle as suspected, and gave way for one who carried out the worst suspicion that had been laid against himself. Balfour had a hankering after the queen's cause so long as there might be any chance of success in it; but Morton was not a man to tolerate alternatives, and Balfour was compelled to declare himself. The regent could hang over his head charges of crime to any amount that might be desirable, and Balfour had to offer a large sum as "composition" or hush money on being received to pardon and favour. He resolved, however, to pay his penalty out of the enemies' purse. Acting the part of a zealous member of the queen's party, he told James Kirkcaldy that he had prepared Blackness for the reception of him and his treasure. He warned Kirkcaldy especially against taking it to any northern strength; for there it would fall into the hands of Huntly, and would be lost to the service of the castle and of the messenger's own brother. To make appearances complete, a small garrison was detached from the Castle of Edinburgh to hold Blackness Castle. It was said that Alexander Stewart, who commanded them, had sold his services to the king's party. However that may be, a larger party surrounded the landing-place, and any resistance to them was useless. Balfour asked the regent if he would abandon the composition on receiving a larger sum otherwise; and as this seemed a reasonable bargain, he accepted it, and so, by handing over the intercepted treasure, Balfour

saved his own money. Such is the story of a contemporary journalist.¹

But a more desperate difficulty was at hand. Queen Elizabeth had to bend to the importunities of her advisers, and England was to strike the one solid blow that was necessary.

There were two points on which Queen Elizabeth had been ever obstinate in her stand against her sage advisers. She would not countenance subjects in dispute with their sovereign, and she resisted the expenditure of money. Over and over again was it shown to her how the expenditure of a few thousand pounds would make Scotland the ally of England, and ever there was resistance or some niggardly dole. The two points of resistance to those servants, who in some measure were her masters, had a hidden connection with each other. It was Queen Elizabeth's delight to consider herself an absolute monarch, whose will it was alike unnatural and criminal to question. In her fancy she was enthroned apart, administering fate to her people like a Semiramis or a Zenobia. But, like many humbler mortals who have nourished pleasant dreams, she shrank from committing her divine right to the rude ordeal of practice. It was pleasanter not to have asked a subsidy than to have been refused it, or to have got it with a grudge. Hence for ordinary purposes she had driven her ministers to raise loans on hard conditions in the city, making a parallel with the youth who tries every other resource before he goes to his parent for the money he finds that he requires.

As to Cecil and the other advisers, there is little doubt that they would rather have gone to the legitimate quarter and faced a Parliament. It was not only that they needed money, but a little bit of constitutional action might have relieved them of a minor difficulty—the protracted furtherance of a practical lie which might any day meet with such an awful contradiction as it received sixty years later. They knew that they lived in a country with a Constitution; and yet they had to support their mistress in the

¹ Bannatyne, 297.

delusion that she was absolute, and that the government of the realm was a pure despotism. When such a crisis was at hand, that all religious liberty and the very existence of England as an independent State was to be put in peril for this delusion, Cecil lost patience and heart. It appeared that if the queen remained obstinate, the services of that zealous and sagacious pilot who had steered the State through so many storms would no longer be available to her. What a loss that would be to one side may be estimated by the value laid on his services by the enemy, who were then plotting against his life in the belief that everything else would be easily conquered if Cecil alone were removed from the heretic queen's side.

On the 1st of April a body of pioneers from England arrived at Leith, and began to make gabions, or large hampers to be filled with earth—a handy material for the construction of temporary ramparts. It was then of recent discovery, and is one of the few munitions of war that have remained from that time to the present almost unchanged. Three days afterwards there was a brief truce, in which a last and vain effort was made to bring the garrison to such terms as their opponents would grant. On the 28th, Drury, who was to command the operations, arrived at Leith with five hundred musketeers and one hundred and forty pikemen.¹ The number finally brought into the field was two thousand. Of these the contribution from England was fifteen hundred. That Scotland should only have furnished five hundred trained soldiers on so critical an occasion sadly shows how the male population had been drained off by the war. For the citizens of Edinburgh, even after the strange events that had closely pursued each other during the past thirty years, there was a novelty in store. An English army was to occupy their city, not as enemies, but as friends and protectors. In 1544 Hertford had burned all the wooden dwellings, and of the stronger buildings had scarcely left one stone above another. Whatever had been done to restore the city in the three years between

¹ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 330.

that invasion and the battle of Pinkie, was left uninjured by Somerset, who took praise to himself for his moderation. The town then, such as it was in 1573, must have been newly built over the ruins left by Hertford. A small number of the existing houses in the old town may be as old as this period, and, as new fashionable hotels on the Parisian model, may have witnessed the siege. Even then the town had strayed beyond the wall built round it after the defeat at Flodden. Excepting, however, the Canongate, the dwellings beyond the wall were chiefly country houses built for defence, as every dwelling whose owner could afford to fortify his household then was in Scotland. The Canongate was a town in itself, stretching from the east end of the city to the Palace and Abbey of Holyrood. Peculiar among cities for variety of surface and remarkable geological features, the outline of the city of Edinburgh at this juncture can be easily traced and realised to any one who is even but casually acquainted with the existing town. The wall passed southward from the castle esplanade down to the West Port, at the west end of the Grassmarket, and then mounted the steep ascent towards Lauriston. A characteristic fragment of it, with one of the small towers which flanked it here and there, may be seen in the boundary wall of the grounds of Heriot's Hospital. Here it turned at a right angle and passed eastward, having to the north the ground then occupied by the ruined buildings of the Kirk-of-Field, and now by the College. On from this it passed the back of the Infirmary, where a fragment of it remains. There was, after many sinuosities, a second turning at right angles, when the wall took the line afterwards marked by St Mary's Wynd and Leith Wynd, being pierced by the Canongate Port, separating the end of the High Street from the suburb of the Canongate. On the north side was the loch, filling the valley where the Princes Street Gardens and railway works now are. This piece of dirty water, and the steepness of the ascent from it, combined to make natural difficulties on that side, and to render much building unnecessary.

The castle, as it then was, had little resemblance to

what we now see, although the conspicuous character of its rocky site would always neutralise in great measure the peculiarities of whatever work of man's hands were laid on it. The platform of the rock was not so completely covered with buildings as now. It may be questioned if any portion of the fortress then besieged is now in existence. Undoubtedly, by any of those architectural tokens which mark their own date beyond dispute, no part of the existing castle proves itself to be older than this siege; and this is made all the more distinct as to the fortress itself by the emphatic way in which the small Norman church within the walls proclaims its age in its architecture. Foundations and fragments of wall there may be overbuilt by new works, but of those completed buildings which bear the marks of their age in decorations and other tokens of an architectural school, there is nothing carrying us back before the siege. One great square block, called David's Tower—the donjon or barbican of the fortress—presided over the other buildings. These appear to have been of a like structure—tall, narrow, stone buildings, like the square towers so profusely scattered over the country.

In everything connected both with the defence and the attack of fortified places, Scotland was at that time behind the age. There were men who could perform a rapid feat of agility and audacity, like the capture of Dumbarton; but the science of the military engineer was not among the possessions of the Scots. As every one knows, improvements in the art of defence follow invention in the art of attack and destruction—there is never occasion for remodelling a fortress that is impregnable to all that the engineering of the age can bring against it. It followed, from this order of precedence, that the Scots fortresses were strong against native attacks, but easily taken by assailants trained in a higher school of engineering—such as that of Italy or Spain. England was behind these countries, yet far in advance of Scotland.

The progress of the art of attacking and defending fortified places was on a parallel principle with that of war in the open field. In both there was a reaction

against the effort after the absolutely impregnable, which had been for centuries the aim of military inventors. Against it gradually grew the principle which inspires the military art of the present day—that ultimate success in warfare lies in the power of slaying the enemy, rather than in the capacity to preserve life from his assaults. The man-at-arms was dropping by degrees the heavy iron scales in which he was encased, that he might more nimbly ply his weapons of assault. So the fortresses were coming down from the heights where, while they were inaccessible, they could injure nothing, and were meeting the enemy in broad horizontal works. The system of fortification called after Vauban, who brought it to its climax, had now thoroughly superseded the tall Norman towers in many parts of Europe, but chiefly in the countries washed by the Mediterranean Sea, and in the Netherlands. For the old projectiles, which did little beyond merely dropping their missiles, height was everything. While the assailants were battering in the door under the cover of a wooden roof, the besieged dropped a stone, which shattered that roof to splinters. But with cannon sending a ball for a mile horizontal with the ground a different structure was appropriate. The ball sent from a height strikes only what lies between it and the earth over a space more or less according to the angle of inclination. A ball sent horizontally sweeps all before it, according to its strength and range. At that time, indeed, height was almost less available than at present, since the shell which scatters destruction round the spot where it is dropped had scarcely come into general use.

The garrison of the castle endeavoured so far to adapt it to the new engineering, that they raised a spur or redan of turf on the flat slope communicating with the High Street. This would have been their strongest point had they known how to fight it. Unfortunately, from its position, it was better suited for injury to the town than the defence of the garrison. Before it was met by a counter-work it had done much mischief among the houses nearly on a level with the castle, while the balls from the higher buildings dropped on the lower parts of the

town with little effect. When the siege-works were completed, one battery fronted the spur or redan. Behind this there were traverses for the protection of the city from the fire of the castle : "At what time also the Tolbooth and the church was fenced with a rampier, forced of turfs, fagots, and other stuff fit for that purpose, whereby the lords of the Parliament did as safely assemble and sit in the Tolbooth, and the people went as quietly and safely to the church to hear divine service, as they at any time did before the wars began, and before that the castle was besieged." ¹

Batteries, with gabions between the guns, were placed according to the facilities afforded by the nearest elevations, the availability of which was increased by raising artificial mounds on them. Of these, one stood on the elevated ground towards the south occupied by Lauriston and Heriot's Hospital ; another farther to the north-west, probably about midway between Port Hopetoun and Princes Street. Another stood nearer to the west end of Princes Street, and other two round to the north, pretty nearly on the line of that street. Thus six batteries made a circuit round the castle as complete as the position of the available eminences permitted. ²

The guns on these batteries pounded on the stone buildings of the castle making great breaches and knocking away the guns. The great keep—David's Tower—was shattered to pieces, and large masses of it falling, obstructed the defensive operations, and stopped the only available supply of water. On the 26th of May an assault was made on the spur, and it was taken. If the small garrison had retained any hopes down to this time, these were now dispersed. A parley was requested, and Grange, Sir Robert Melville, and the Laird of Pittarrow were let down from the castle with ropes to treat for a surrender. But no terms could be obtained for the leaders—especially for Grange, who had broken his faith, and

¹ Holingshed, continuation, 411.

² Survey and Journal of the Siege of the Castle of Edinburgh ; Bannatyne Miscellany, ii. 65.

for Lethington, who had counselled and assisted him in the act. On his return the captain found that the choice of holding out was no longer in his hands—his garrison would no longer obey him. Desertion and mutiny, like many other evil things, must be judged by the surrounding conditions. The garrison were in the hands of a desperate man, to whom the privileges of those who are beaten in fair warfare were denied. In this last extremity a stroke of policy was attempted. The captain went forth on the 29th and rendered himself, not to his own countryman Morton, but to the English general. The party were to be in the hands, not of their Government, which would treat them as deserters or traitors, but of the English invader, with whom they were at fair war. The surviving garrison—about a hundred in number—were now relieved; while the leaders were received within Drury's quarters, and there preserved to abide the result of instructions from London. Grange and Lethington wrote a joint letter of appeal to Cecil on the ground of old co-operation and friendship—an appeal so urgent and pitiful as to be scarce in harmony with the heroic reputation of Grange.¹ The decision of the English queen, in a letter by herself to Morton, simply was: "For the prisoners taken in the Castle of Edinburgh, who have been the chief disquieters of that realm,—seeing the offences done were done in our cousin the king's realm, and against him and his laws, we refer the judgment and ordering of those matters to him and to the laws of that realm, except only for Robert Melville, whom we have known heretofore to have dealt very sincerely with us." She cannot think that he has fallen away from all his fair promises, and asks that favour be showed him and no extremities used in the mean time.²

This judgment has been treated as a cruel abandonment of the unfortunate Grange to his bitter personal enemy; but though this was its effect, any decision by Queen Elizabeth taking the disposal of the prisoners into her own hands would have been an interference with the

¹ Cited, P. F. Tytler.

² Hopetoun MS.

internal affairs of Scotland, and might have changed the character of the whole transaction, making it something different from a mere temporary assistance to the Scots Government to enable it to restore order. There were many and urgent appeals to Morton to spare him, but in vain. He was hanged at the market-cross of Edinburgh on the 3d of August. The ignominious death of the felon has ever seemed a hard fate to befall one who, for all his flagrant errors, had adorned life with so much heroism and courtesy—but it was the fate of the deserter. Whether it was that the latent resolution was planted in his heart by the siren when she chose to surrender to him, or Lethington's subtle logic mastered his judgment, or he really believed it to be his duty to change sides and hold the castle against those who had put it in his hands, is a mystery. But for men who follow such desperate courses, it is ever the bargain with fate, that they know what it has in store for them, and that it is on that knowledge that their claim for the reputation of magnanimity is founded. If the amount of mischief done or spared by the act could be pleaded, the balance stood terribly against him; and yet we must believe in the high qualities assigned to him by his friends, one of whom has told us his character in the following beautiful sketch:—

“He was humble, gentle, and meek—like a lamb in the house, but like a lion in the field. A lusty, stark, and well-proportioned personage, but hardy and of a magnanym courage; secret and prudent in all his enterprises, so that never ane that he made or devised mislucked when he was present himself. And when he was victorious, he was very merciful and naturally liberal, and enemy till greediness and ambition, and friend till all men in adversity, and fell oft in trouble to debate innocent men from such as would oppress them. So that these, his worthy qualities, were also partly causes and instruments of his wreck; for they promoved him so in the opinions of many, that some loved him for his religion, uprightness, manliness; others, again, depended upon him for his good fortune and apparent promotion, whereby divers of them hoped to be advanced and rewarded, sup-

posing that honours and offices could not fail to fall to him—whilks all he wanted in his own default; for he fled from avarice and abhorred ambition, and refused sundry great offices—even the office of regent—and benefices and great pensions. So, wanting place and substance to reward, he was incontinent abandoned by his ambitious dependers so soon as they saw him at a strait, and drew then to such others as they perceived to shoot at more profitable marks. Thus he was as mikel envied by them that were of a vile and unworthy nature as he was beloved by all honest men.”¹

While the citizens of Edinburgh beheld their formidable enemy hanging from the gibbet, a strange passage between him and one who had recently passed from them stirred their minds with a curious awe. When Knox was in St Andrews he received a visit from his old friend David Lindsay, minister of Leith. They had some talk about the events of the day, which naturally centred on Grange and the castle, when Knox said: “Well, brother, I thank God—I have desired all this day to have you, that I may send you yet to yon man at the castle, whom ye ken I have loved so dearly. Go, I pray, and tell him that I have sent you to him yet ance, to warn and bid him, in the name of God, leave that evil course, and give over that castle; if not, he shall be brought down over the walls of it with shame, and hang against the sun: so God has assured me.” Lindsay went to the castle and delivered his message. He thought Melville was somewhat moved, and Grange a little; but Lethington delivered his opinion of Knox and his prophecy in two words—the one a substantive, the other a predicate. The substantive word was “prophet;” but the other is of a class which modern taste excludes from print, and it must be sought in the original authority.² Knox repeated the prophecy in the pulpit, with the addition that the castle would “run like a sand-glass;” and on his friend Robert Hamilton expressing himself sceptically, the prophet said, vehe-

¹ Sir James Melville's Memoirs, 258.

² Diary of James (not *Sir* James) Melville, 34.

mently, "Thou that wilt not believe my warrant will see it with thy eyes that day, and shall say, 'What have I to do here?'" And now behold the sequel. Hamilton and his servant were present at the rendering. They saw "the forework of the castle all demolished, and moving like a sandy brae; they saw the men of war all set in order, the captain, with a little cut of a staff in his hand, taken down over the wall upon the ladders: and Mr Robert, troubled with the throng of the people, says to his man, 'Go, what have I ado here?' and in going away, the servant remembers him of that sermon and the words: wha was compelled to glorify God, and say he was true prophet."

When Grange was a captive, the same David Lindsay who had taken Knox's message went to him again. He was one of those who interceded with Morton, being commissioned to offer him Grange's whole means and estate, and an obligation by his beaten enemy to become an exile, backed by "a band of manrent" signed by all his friends; but Lindsay had, like others, to bring a hopeless answer. It then appears that Grange grew pious and penitent, and laid much store by an expression of Knox, implying that there was yet salvation for him, but none for the Mephistopheles who had led him astray: "For the one, I am sorry that so should befall him, yet God assures me there is mercy for his soul; for that other, I have no warrant that ever he should be well." Meditating on these things, Grange expressed to his visitor a hope that when to others it should seem that all was over, he might give his friend "a token of the assurance of that mercy" of which the man of God had spoken. How this was fulfilled cannot be otherwise told than in the narrator's strange and touching words: "So about three hours after noon he was brought out, and Mr David with him; and about four, the sun being west about the north-west neuk of the steeple, he was put aff the ladder, and his face first fell to the east, but within a bonny while turned about to the west, and there remained against the sun; at whilk time Mr David, ever present, says he marked him, when all thought he was away, to lift up his hands that were

bound before him, and lay them down again softly, whilk moved him with exclamation to glorify God before all the people."¹

The comments of a philosopher on this strange story would perhaps be, that the worldly wisdom of Knox might tell him what Morton would do when victorious, and also that he was a man to be victorious in such a struggle; but to feel and know the nature of the times, it is well to have such stories as they are originally told.

The other leading spirit passed away in a different fashion, and was followed by far less sympathy. Lethington was found dead after the surrender: it was supposed that he had poisoned himself, or, as Sir James Melville says, that "he took a drink, and died as the old Romans were wont to do."²

According to an old feudal usage, his dead body was preserved, that justice might be done on him. The custom seemed strange and barbarous, but it was founded on rough notions of high justice. A man might be said to be dead when he was alive, and the tribunals might thus forfeit his property for crimes charged against him without affording him a hearing. When the dead body was produced in court there could be no question of the death. When Elizabeth sent her answer about Grange, however, she commented on this practice, saying, "It is not our manner in this country to show cruelties upon the dead bodies of unconvicted, but to suffer them straight to be buried and put in the earth."³

In connection with his first appearance upon the stage of history, some conjectures were offered as to the spirit that seemed to animate his strange and wayward-looking policy. The reader has had a fair opportunity of estimating how far they are authorised. He was charged with atheism; but that he denied, saying, "I have been brought up from my youth and instructed in the fear of God, and to know that He has appointed heaven for the habitation of His elect, and also hell for the everlasting

¹ James Melville's Diary, 33-36.

² Memoirs, 256.

³ Hopetoun MS.

dwelling-place of the reprobate." He complained bitterly that Knox had slandered him in charging him with saying "that there is neither heaven nor hell, and that they are things devised to fray bairns, with other such language tending to the like effect, unworthy of Christian ears, to be rehearsed in the hearing of men ; which words before God never at any time proceeded from my mouth, nor yet any sounding to the like purpose, nor whereof any such sentence might be gathered."¹ Knox died before he could reply to this denial, and so left a controversy full of interesting promise unfinished.

The question may here occur to a reader whether Lethington left behind him many letters ; and if he did, and they survive, it may be natural to ask whether they reveal much of his subtle nature, or of the tendency of the times. Many of his letters exist, but they are composed for those who know what he deals with, and can take subtle hints for distinct conclusions. They are deep calling unto deep, and conspicuously destitute of the garrulous vivacity that gives distinctness and picturesqueness to the correspondence of Sadler, Throckmorton, and Randolph. He commits no unnecessary secrets to paper, and both what he describes and what he thinks, is told in a sort of intellectual cipher that requires a key.

Yet if this man's character remains a mystery, it is not for want of ample comment on it by his neighbours. These comments are more full of fear and wrath than of affection. In a lampoon attributed to Buchanan he is typified as the Chameleon : "For what thing ever it be appliat to, it seems to be of the same colour, and imitates all hues except only the white and red ; and for this cause ancient writers commonly compares it to ane flatterer, whilk imitates all the whole manners of him he fains himself to be the friend to, except white, whilk is taken to be the symbol and token given commonly in device of colours to signify simpleness and loyalty, and red signifying manliness and heroical courage."²

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 415.

² "Chamæleon, written by Mr George Buchanan against the Laird

The estimate of his capacities, to be traced in the criticism, whether friendly or hostile, of his contemporaries, is that they were too great for so narrow a field as Scotland, and would have better adorned a greater sphere. This feeling was in some measure, perhaps, fed by the deference paid to him by the Queen of England and her sagacious advisers. But if they courted him as one who had much power to do mischief, it may be doubted if they acknowledged that he would have been exactly suited for their own work, in sagely and cautiously managing the interests of a great community. His pungent sarcasm was his great power. He had other qualities,

of Lidingtone ;" *Miscellanea Scotica*, 1818, vol. ii. This edition professes to be "from the manuscript in the Cotton Library." There is a manuscript of the *Chamæleon* there, but it is not in Buchanan's handwriting. The title of an edition in 1710 is, 'The *Chamæleon*, or the Crafty Statesman ; described in the Character of Mr Maitland of Lethington.' This little piece has a strong family likeness to the "Detection," especially in piling crime over crime up to a classical climax. Take the following specimen : "After the death of the king, devised by him, execute by the Earl Bothwell—for fear of the said earl he lurked a while out of Court, until the time the queen at Carberry Hill came to the lords, and the Earl Bothwell fled to Dunbar. Then he came to Parliament, and with some others participant of the king's slaughter would have had the queen slane by Act of Parliament ; and not finding many consenting thereto, and especially the Earl of Murray, then chosen regent, being of the contrair, he sollicitate some privie men to gar hang her on her bed with her awn belt, that by that way he and his partners in the king's murther might be delivered of ane witness ; knawing well the queen's nature, that when she was miscontent of any man, she would tell all his secrets as she did know of him. This purpose not proceeding as he desired, he turned him first in flattering with the queen, and sent to her, being in Lochleven, ane picture of the deliverance of the lyon by the mouse, and next turned his hail wit to the destruction of the Earl of Murray, thinking that the wicked would not profit greatly, so just a man having the supreme power, and as seeing that the queen's craftyness was able at the long to overthrow the Ear of Murray's simpleness ; so he lended all his wits to the said earl's eversion and the queen's restitution, and proceeded in this cause partly by making ane faction of the counsellors and partakers of the king's murder—of men light of fantasy and covetous of geer ; partly by corrupting of my Lord of Murray's friends and servants ; and travelled principally with the Laird of Grange, thinking it would be ane great strength to the faction to have the Castle of Edinburgh at their command."

but they were rather rhetorical than practical. He had a fine discrimination, and could, when he pleased, quit the scorner's chair, and rise into the earnest eloquence befitting a solemn occasion. The compositions, written or verbal, revealing his faculties to the world, are short and casual. Among the longest and most interesting is the last—a remonstrance with his great enemy Morton, sent from the castle at the juncture which the events just recorded show to have been desperate. Morton himself was at that time sick almost unto death. We have seen how little vitality remained in the poor diseased body of his enemy ; yet is he full of high hope and expectation of coming prosperity. The remonstrance was sent through one who had been the common friend of both. It complains of benefits heaped by him on Morton and but ill requited, for now his old friend had stripped him of lands and wealth and fair fame. It was he who had brought against him the foul charge of connivance in the slaughter of Darnley, calling it “a crime whereof he knows in his conscience I was as innocent as himself,” an assurance admitting of a double meaning. For all these evil turns, enumerated with eloquent bitterness, he yet concludes :—

“Thus I have touched his part towards me and mine towards him, whereof of reason I think I am and has been evil used ; yet I speak it not at this time to reproach him of ingratitude, but for ane other intent more godly and honourable for us both. Since God has visiet baith him and me with corporal diseases, and little likelihood that ever we shall meet face to face, I would wish, for relief of baith our consciences, that these causes were removed, and hereafter better effects to follow. I know him to be a wise man, and able enough to foresee that the world is not so tethered but, if he inlaike, they that he ought to care for may have need of friends. It may be, that for all that is past, I may be in place where I can both do good and ill—stand my friends in stead, and be an evil neighbour to my enemies. I desire not to be the goat to cast down at night the milk I have given all the day. Since I have done so mikel for the house of Angus and Morton, that

some time he said there should be a memorial of my kindness remain in their charter-chests, I desire not any occasion be left that may move me to wish the downcasting of that I helped to build.

"If before he inlaik he will make effectual demonstration that he minds the reparation of my loss in a reasonable manner, I can yet be content that all the evil offices past be buried in perpetual oblivion, and I continue hereafter the goodwill I sometime bore himself to those he shall leave behind him; and I doubt but ere it be long, and sooner nor many believes, the time will come when they will think my kindness worth the purchasing."¹

Morton now stood alone, supreme in power. Murray, Lennox, Mar, Lethington, Grange, Knox, his foes, his friends, and his rivals, all were gone, and there was a free arena to act his own part in. He was one of those, indeed, to whom a coadjutor powerful enough to be a rival is almost a greater hindrance than an avowed enemy. As to his personal character, purity of life, justice, and mercy, had no place in his moral nature. But he had firmness, business capacity, and a scorn of danger, and these were the qualities needed for Scotland. He put the country in order, and gave it peace.

We now come to a sudden lull. The ever-succeeding troubles of a distracted country, and the efforts of the narrator to trace them through their countless perplexities, find relief together. Events have been chasing each other so fast, that when we look back it is a novelty to realise that all are crowded into a period no longer than twelve years. For the future, three great disturbing forces, prolific in action, are seen no more. In the first place, the game of conquest has been entirely played out by England. We may say, perhaps, that it came to an end with the Reformation; but there was still room for it, and it might start up any day. Now its place was occupied. On both sides

¹ Letter to the young laird of Carmichael; Bannatyne's Memorials, Appendix, 339. The very unusual Scots word "inlaik" means to abandon. It has a common etymology with the English expression "to lack in."

of the Border men looked to another solution of the problem how the two nations should be made into one. Secondly, It followed that there was no longer danger from abroad, since French protection was no longer needed. The ancient league, if not dead, was paralysed, and all its long romance of heroism and kindly sympathy was at an end. We shall find that a dread of the restoration of French influence had a reactionary effect in favour of the religion which was oppressed by the French Government, but the actual influence was at an end. Thirdly, Queen Mary has no longer a place in the history of her country. She was in one sense busier than ever ; for she still conducted an active political correspondence, and the restraints she was subjected to tasked her for increased industry, skill, and vigilance. She kept England in continual peril. At the Vatican, at Paris, and at Madrid, she was still a political power. But in Scotland, however many may have been the hearts secretly devoted to her, her name passed out of the arena of political action and discussion.

Through all this long scene of violence a child was growing up in quiet seclusion, from which he was some day to come forth and be lord over all. As his mother in her infancy had been devoutly guarded from the foreign enemy, so had he from the dangers of the civil war raging around his place of refuge. The two stories are a remarkable testimony to the constitutional spirit prevalent in the country—the spirit of following old precedent so far as it could be followed with a wholesome safety. The right to change the occupant of the throne was asserted and practised. The form of its exercise made the smallest deviation that was attainable ; it resolved itself into a mere anticipation of an event likely to occur in the course of the world's changes—the child taking the place of the parent. It would have been altogether an easier business for the king's party had they chosen some strong man—Murray or Morton, for instance—who could have helped them by fighting his own battle. But feeling it to be their constitutional duty to pass the throne on to the infant representative of their line of kings, they guarded the fragile

being whom they had enthroned with loyal zeal and determination.

The office of personal guardian to the king was united with that of regent in the Earl of Mar. On his death the guardianship was given to his brother. Sir James Melville has bequeathed to us a pleasant sketch of the principal figures in the young king's household. First there is Sir Alexander Erskine, his governor, "a gallant and matured gentleman, loved and honoured by all men for his good qualities and great discretion, no ways factious nor envious, a lover of all honest men, and desired ever to see men of good conversation about the prince, rather than his own nearer friends, if he found them not so mete." The master of the household was a man of different character; he was
 a Laird of Drumwhassel, and is pronounced "ambitious and greedy," "a man whose chief care it was to advance himself and his friends." There were four teachers—George Buchanan, Peter Young, the Abbot of Cambuskenneth, and the Abbot of Dryburgh. These abbots were, of course, lay owners of the abbey lands, and it is simply said of them that they were "wise and modest." The two other teachers are brought out in a group with the Countess of Mar: "My Lady Mar was wise and sharp, and held the king in great awe, and so did Mr George Buchanan. Mr Peter Young was more gentle, and was loath to offend the king at any time, carrying himself warily as a man who had a mind to his own weal by keeping of his majesty's favour. But Mr George was a stoic philosopher, who looked not far before the hand; a man of notable endowments for his learning and knowledge of Latin poesy; much honoured in other countries; pleasant in conversation; rehearsing at all occasions moralities short and instructive, whereof he had abundance, inventing when he wanted. He was also of good religion for a poet; but he was easily abused, and so facile that he was led with any company that he haunted for the time, which made him fashious in his auld days, for he spake and wrote as they that were about him for the time informed him."¹ The latter part of the charac-

¹ Memoirs, 261, 262.

ter is not consistent with the stoic severity of the former, and leads one to suspect that the narrator desired to attribute what is said of him by Buchanan rather to the influence of his rivals or enemies than to the unbiassed judgment of the historian. It is hard at this day precisely to understand what it is to be "of good religion for a poet," and it is observable that King James himself uses the same words when speaking of his master.¹

A keen observer has left on record how "King James used to say of a person in high place about him, that he ever trembled at his approach, it minded him so of his pedagogue."² It is easy to see which of his tutors is here meant. Buchanan was a man stern by nature, who had been trained in a stern school. He had to endure poverty and privation, with all the humiliations that attend on such hardships, while he must have been conscious of the high intellectual faculties which in the end led him to renown and greatness. We see in all his philosophy the fruit of such a combination—of fame, position, and affluence coming after the nature has been soured by hardships and humiliations. It was the nature of one antagonistic to the social conditions around—the enemy of all wealth and power that was not gained or at least held by merit. It was a disposition in unison with the national temperament; and the traditions of the rebuffs which he bestowed on his silly royal pupil have been preserved by the common people with a zeal and told with a zest which speak of a fellow-feeling with the relentless stoic of humble birth. These stories are characteristic enough. We can easily, for instance, realise the scene where, the tutor having inflicted dorsal discipline, the Countess of Mar, called to the spot by the wailings of the royal victim, denounces the lifting of the hand against the Lord's anointed, but gets no better token of regret or atonement than the intimation, made in grim derision, that she is at liberty to kiss the afflicted part.³

¹ Works, 1616, p. 480.

² Francis Osborne, *Advice to a Son*, 1658, p. 28.

³ Irving's *Memoirs of Buchanan*, 160. The story is taken from

The royal pupil appears to have had both a capacity and an inclination for acquiring languages. Killigrew, who saw him in his eighth year, was invited by Buchanan and Young to try him on any chapter of the Bible; and the result was, that the boy was found able to read off the selected chapter "out of Latin into French, and out of French after into English, as well as few men could have added anything to his translation."¹ An observer less likely to see a royal pupil with partial eyes, the Rev. James Melville, was equally delighted with the royal boy's proficiency. He saw him one day at Stirling: it was "the sweetest sight in Europe that day for strange and extraordinary gifts of ingine, judgment, memory, and languages. I heard him discourse, walking up and down in the old Lady Mar's hand, of knowledge and ignorance, to my great marvel and astonishment."² He preserved through life the apparatus of these accomplishments. He had always abundant Latin at his command. When the English courtiers commended the learning of their king, he would drop a word on the advantages he had enjoyed as the pupil of so great a scholar as Buchanan. The teacher could not impart his genius to his pupil. In Buchanan's hands the Latin was not a dead language. He made it respond to the fervency of his thoughts, as if the ideas and the words had been born together. He was a man of vivid imagination and vehement opinion; yet was he able to express whatever these qualities demanded in language which was full and rich and powerful, without any transgression of classical purity. Read after the master's composition, the pupil's is like task-work. Yet it seems scarcely just to call King James a pedant, since that word seems to imply not merely a propensity for the display of acquirements, but the limitation of their extent to such as a schoolboy

Dr George Mackenzie's *Lives*, which, though a book in three volumes folio, is no better authority than tradition or gossip. I think the learned and scrupulous biographer of Buchanan would hardly have paid so much attention to this, and some other anecdotes of the same kind, had he not felt a sympathy with the rigid stoicism exemplified in them.

¹ Cited, P. F. Tytler, an. 1574.

² M'Crie's *Melville*, 30.

may acquire. That "he was a scholar, and a ripe and good one," is a commendation that might more justly have been given to him than to the man of far higher genius to whom it was applied, if we take the word scholar in its modern acceptation. And indeed the man who in later times had the greatest name among us for pure scholarship has left us his supreme testimony to the extent of the acquirements of King James.¹

One of the traditional anecdotes about Buchanan tells us that when charged with having made the king a pedant, he answered it was the best he could make of him. But there is evidence that he strove to make him something infinitely higher—to make him a great constitutional monarch, "a patriot king," after the notions of kingly duty which the teacher had drunk in from classical sources. He proclaimed the substance of this part of his teaching to the world in his book on the constitutional powers of the crown in Scotland.² He explains that the opinions announced in that book came into existence as he thought over the events connected with the deposition of Queen Mary, and that he worked them up into a shape proper for the instruction of her son. Expressed in the solemn eloquence of this remarkable work there may be seen throughout the spirit of the schoolmaster, in the simple arrangement of cause and effect, by which virtue is rewarded and vice punished. There is the brilliant sunny picture of the virtuous monarch, conscious of the beneficence which his power enables him to distribute among mankind, basking in the smiles of a happy and contented people. Living, he is the likeliest thing on earth to the beneficent Deity; dying, he leaves behind him a name to be for ever associated with all that is great and good. On the other side is the dark picture of the reproving conscience recalling the powers and opportunities dedicated

¹ Parr says, in his introduction to Bellenden's book '*De Statu :*' "*Regem vero illum, et à doctrina fuisse haud mediocriter instructum, et doctorum hominum maxime studiosum, nemo est qui ignoret.*"—P. lxiii.

² *De Jure Regni apud Scotos.*

to malignity and cruelty instead of beneficence, the life of terror and distrust, a bloody grave, a memory sacred to infamy ;—and so he goes on, waxing warmer and warmer in denunciatory eloquence, until he reaches something like a Ciceronian climax, conferring sanctity on the tyrannicide, and denouncing his victim as a monster unworthy of a grave among men.¹ Nor was this mere empty denunciation. There were precedents in Scots history for the deposition and the punishment of wicked kings. They derived their right from the people, and to the people they were responsible. Hereditary succession was a mere principle of convenience for the avoiding of frequent elections, and it was well to have it in action until it placed a tyrant on the throne.²

Buchanan was then at work upon his History ; and as he had some thirty fictitious kings to deal with, he was enabled to adjust the conduct and the fate of each to his own satisfaction. His History became, indeed, what the French call the "*pièces justificatives*" of his essay. Both may be called practical works, in as far as they bear testimony to a spirit which had been for some time forming and strengthening in the public mind. Buchanan gave

¹ "Quod si mihi legem ferre liceret, juberem (quod Romani in monstris procurandis facere solebant) id genus hominum in solas terras deportari, aut in alto, procul a conspectu terræ, demergi, ne contagio etiam mortuorum hominibus officeret ; interfectores autem præmia decerni, non ab universo tantum populo, sed a singulis ; quemadmodum vulgo fieri solet iis, qui lupos aut ursos occiderunt, aut catulos eorum deprehenderunt."—Urie's edition, 117.

² In his dedication to the young king, when he was ten years old, of the tragedy of Baptistes, Buchanan thus abridged and concentrated his precepts : "Illud autem peculiarius ad te videri potest spectare, quod tyrannorum cruciatus, et cum florere maxime videntur, miserias dilucide exponat. Quod te nunc intelligere non conducibile modo, sed etiam necessarium existimo : ut mature odisse incipias, quod tibi semper est fugiendum. Volo etiam hunc libellum apud posteros testem fore, siquid aliquando pravis consultoribus impulsus, vel regni licentia rectam educationem superante secus committas, non præceptoribus, sed tibi, qui eis recte monentibus non sis obsecutus, id vitio vertendum esse. Det Dominus meliora, et quod est apud tuum Salustium, tibi benefacere ex consuetudine in naturam vertat. Quod equidem cum multis et spero, et opto. Vale. Sterlino, ad Calend. Nov. 1576."—Poemata, 224.

clearness and beauty to sentiments in which many of his contemporaries concurred. They are found, indeed, in the works of his own preceptor, John Mair.¹ But Buchanan's flight is too high and classical to give instruction on the practical working of the constitution of his country. Those who read his book on the rights of the Crown, expecting to find such information in it, will be as much disappointed as the politicians who expected a revelation of the interior working of the Roman constitution when the manuscript of Cicero's book on government was found at last, and edited by Angelo Mai. All effective working power throughout is that vague entity called the people. The records of the proceedings of the Estates, when they checked the power of the king and took the executive on themselves, were old, and it was not the custom for historians to pore over such documents. They fell to the lot of the lawyers. These were becoming loyal as the philosophers and divines became republican; and just at that time they were bringing forth the old records, and mutilating them of those parts which bore testimony to a power of control over the acts of the sovereign.

Buchanan was signally unfortunate in his immediate object. The king, who spoke respectfully of his genius and scholarship, uttered his detestation of his teacher's opinions in words not to be misunderstood. When he followed so far the example of his teacher as to set down a code of conduct for his son when he should ascend the throne, it was in the way of an antidote to the poison of the teaching of Buchanan.² But the words of the stoic

¹ "Populus liber primo regi dat robur, cujus potestas a toto populo dependet," and "Regem et posteros pro demeritis populus potest exauthorare sicut et primo instituere."—*De Gestis Scotorum*, 175, 176.

² "I would have you to be well versed in authentic histories and in the chronicles of all nations, but especially in our own histories—*ne sis peregrinus domi*—the example whereof most nearly concerns you. I mean not of such infamous invectives as Buchanan's or Knox's Chronicles. And if any of these infamous libels remain until your days, use the law upon the keepers thereof; for in that point I would have you a Pythagorist, to think that the very spirits of these

did not fall to the ground. Could he prophetically have foreseen the events of the next century, he might have found his opinions exercising an influence powerful enough to appal even their author. His precepts were cited by his countrymen when they began the great rebellion, and thence down to the Revolution they were ever on the lips of the opponents of the Stewarts.

It might be said that the new regent was set forth on his career by Queen Elizabeth; but he knew the temper of his countrymen too well to govern for England. For once Queen Elizabeth had helped her friends liberally and effectively. It was perhaps well for the stability of the new Government that she did not tempt the regent by continuing open-handed. He had other resources, which, though they made bitter enemies, greatly strengthened his hands. The civil war had opened a great mine of forfeitures, from which he raised a revenue sufficient to preserve order and make himself formidable.

Killigrew, returning as English ambassador to the country he had known so miserably distracted, found the community waxing fat and becoming supercilious. His reports home took their tone, in some measure, from the spirit in which a powerful man sees the dependant he has helped able to stand unaided and carry out his own affairs. If in such a change there be something slightly to mortify the pride of the patron, yet there is consolation in a more substantial shape,—there is release from the partner who is so liable to be a drag downwards, and the hope that he may prove a respectable and efficient ally—possibly a friend in case of need.

The regent's first troubles were to come from the Church. He had ever stood by the Protestant cause; but for many reasons he was not personally so acceptable to the clergy as the decorous Murray. There was an important point on which his conduct failed to satisfy

archibellouses of rebellion have made transition in them that hoards their books or maintains their opinions, punishing them even as it were their authors risen again."—*Basilikon Doron*; King James's Works, 176.

them. It was part of their creed that the civil magistrate—that is to say, the governing power in general—was under an obligation to enforce on the people that righteousness of which the clergy were the exponents and proclaimers. To enable statesmen effectually to perform this duty, it was befitting that they should have a fellowship with the ecclesiastical tribunals. On these they were ingrafted by the system of lay eldership, which gave them actual voice and place in the ecclesiastical assemblies, although, of course, subject to the precedence and constitutional superiority of the clergy.

In the ecclesiastical meetings, which as yet were but incoherent imitations of the assemblies and synods of the Huguenots, Murray and other Lords of the Congregation had given encouragement by personal attendance and action to the “lay eldership.” At that time, however, the rehearsal which the Huguenot or Calvinistic system was offering to the world at Geneva, had not been completely played out in its long and hot contest between a people desiring freedom of action and life, and a clergy determined to subject them to the hard and close rule of their own theocracy. In the pious and moral rule of Farel and Calvin there was of course nothing of the capricious cruelty by which unholy despotisms have been stained. Though it may be open to question whether any human beings might righteously impose on others the rigid and cruel restraints contained in their code, it was one of justice, in so far as there was in it no respect of persons. Of the purity of motive in its chief exponents and champions there cannot be a doubt; and yet, allowance made for all these palliations, it was a dire despotism, and a sad temptation to poor erring man to play fantastic tricks with his little brief authority.

The Genevan theocracy had but its day, and occupied a small space in the map of Europe. It is not likely that in Scotland, even in the days of the highest enthusiasm for the Presbyterian system, the temper of the people would have submitted to a repetition of the Geneva affair. It came, however, very near to Scotland, on account of many obvious peculiarities in the origin and history of the

Scots Reformation. Whether from his attending to this episode in history as a possible precedent to the claims likely to be made by the clergy of Scotland, or for other reasons, Morton did not co-operate with the clergy to the extent of their desire. He showed no alacrity to profit by his opportunity of holding a subordinate position in their assemblages. It was naturally a delicate duty to press the acceptance of this privilege, and several references to the unpleasant affair in the records of the Assembly are dubious or incoherent. At length, however, at an Assembly which sat down in March 1574, a testimony or protest on the matter was adopted. In the preamble, after setting forth the doctrine for the teaching of which the visible Church exists, it is laid down that, "for preservation of the holy ministry and Kirk in purity, the Lord has appointed assemblies and conventions, not only of the persons of the ministry, but also of the haill members of the Kirk professing Christ—the whilk Kirk of God has continually used, and uses the same assemblies, sanctified by the Word of God, and authorised by the presence of Jesus Christ." After further matter of the same kind comes the specific charge against the regent and his subordinates in the government of the country:—

"And now at this present the Kirk is assembled according to the godly ordinance, and looks to have concurrence of their brethren in all estates, and wishes of God that your grace and Lords of Privy Council will authorise the Kirk in this present Assembly by your presence, or by others having your commission in your grace and lordships' name, as members of the Kirk of God. For as your grace's presence and the nobility's should be unto us most comfortable, and so most earnestly wished of all, so your grace's answer is to us most dolorous and lamentable." A passage following on this is indistinct, and probably inaccurately preserved; but again distinctness is resumed, thus: "Therefore, as ye esteem yourselves to be members of Christ and of His Kirk, show the fruit thereof, of the whilk it is not the least to join yourselves to the Kirk, not only by hearing the Word and receiving the sacraments, but also in convening with your brethren in the holy

assemblies. The whilk to do we give you admonition in the name of the Lord, extending this our admonition to every one, of whatsoever estate, that are present with your grace and lordships."¹

One can hardly doubt that the bulk of that body of clergymen who professed and pushed the Calvinistic system, personally followed the ascetic rules which they desired to enforce on the community at large. From their own utterings, however, it must be inferred that they found it impossible to extend their rigid rule to any considerable extent over their lay brethren. The Assemblies are ever denouncing the sins of the land, and that with so large an amount of loathsome descriptiveness that they are unfit for public repetition at the present day. The catalogue of iniquities was pressed on the notice of the regent's Government by men who believed, and gave occasional hints of their belief, that the beginning of his correction should be with himself; while they told him, as a general conclusion, that "most necessary it was thought of all that your grace's help and assistance should be sought and implored thereunto, that the wrath of God, which presently hangeth over this realm by reason of the same enormities, may be taken away."

The clergy were in the mean time putting their own house in order, according to the decorous simplicity which they professed to hold as the rule of their polity. In 1574, the Assembly, "seeing not only it becomes the true messengers of the Word of salvation to bear in their conscience a good testimony of unfeigned humility and simplicity of their hearts, but also in external habit and behaviour to represent the sobriety and humility of their minds, that the mouths of the godless generation which are opened to blaspheme the godly calling of the ministry may be shut up from just accusation or slandering of the same," it is desirable that the clergy and their assistants should be attired "in a comely and decent clothing, as becometh the gravity of their vocation."² A committee was appointed to report on the proper character of such

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 292, 293.

² Ibid., 322.

clothing, and they certainly performed their duty with a comprehensiveness and minuteness which must have entitled them to the praise and gratitude of their constituents. They reported: "First, we think all kind of broidering unseemly; all vagaries of velvet on gowns, hoses, or coat; and all superfluous and vain cutting out, steiking [stitching] with silks; all kind of costly sewing on garments, or sumptuous or large steiking with silks; all kind of costly sewing or variant hues in sarks; all kind of light and variant hues in clothing, as red, blue, yellow, and sicklike, whilk declares the lightness of the mind; all wearing of rings, bracelets, buttons of silver, gold, or other metal; all kind of superfluity of cloth in making of hose; all using of plaids in the kirk by readers or ministers—namely, in time of their ministry, and using their office; all kind of gowning, coating, or doubleting, or breeches of velvet, satin, taffeta, or sicklike; all costly gilding of whingers and knives, or sicklike; all silk hats, or hats of divers and light colours; but that their haille habit be of grave colour, as black, russet, sad grey, sad brown, or serges, worsted camlet, grogram, lytes worsted, or sicklike."

The brethren not only heartily adopted this sumptuary code, but undertook a daring obligation for "their wives to be subject to the same order."¹ We have here a picturesque example of a new force coming from England, to influence the character of the Protestant Church in Scotland. Almost everything had hitherto come from France; but now something from the secular rigidity of the English Puritans was to be superinduced on whatever Scotland had accepted from the fierce fanaticism of the Huguenots. This new influence, not content with purity in morals, carried its supremacy into the region of the æsthetic.

It is only natural that those who thus treated themselves should indicate some uneasiness about the recent encouragement which the Government had been giving to Prelacy, by filling up some of the sees. There had not

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 335.

as yet been a word in the statute law of the realm against the old system of Church government. The clergy themselves had been meeting in Assemblies, and had adjusted a polity on the Huguenot model; but when they sent the outline of their system, in the shape of the Book of Discipline, for the approval of the Estates, the approval was refused, and the refusal was embittered by Lethington's scornful sarcasm. In a stringent statute passed by the Parliament of 1572 for the suppression of Popery, and the maintenance of "the true and haly Kirk," that Kirk is to act through "the lawful Archbishops, Bishops, Superintendents, and Commissioners of the Dioceses and Provinces of this realm by themselves, and the ministers and readers serving at the kirks within their charges."¹

The bishops had not yet been repudiated in the ecclesiastical courts either by positive enactment or the ignoring of their existence. In the lists of committees, and otherwise, they have precedence over the untitled clergy, the Archbishop of Glasgow going first. But they certainly did not exercise their old ecclesiastical authority; and the tenor of all dealing with them by their brethren is to bring them to the level of the working clergy, and make their titles a mere honorary distinction, like those of the bishops in the early Irish Church. Their rank would thus be general, not diocesan; and they would only hold precedence, like doctors of divinity, or other brethren decorated with university honours.² On one occasion, in the beginning of 1574, it was specifically laid down: "Anent the jurisdiction of bishops in their ecclesiastical function, the Kirk presently assembled has concluded that the same shall not exceed the jurisdiction of superintendents, whilk heretofore they have had and presently has; and that they shall be subject to the discipline of

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 71. We have seen that the word "church" is employed in the title of the Book of Common Order, but in the legislative and official documents it is ever "the kirk." This is closer to the original, *Kypiov oikos*, than the English term, or even the German *Kirche*.

² See Book of the Universal Kirk, 257 *et seq.*

the General Assembly, as members thereof, as the superintendents has been heretofore in all sorts.”¹

At the same time a sort of guerilla warfare was levied against the bishops individually. The Archbishop of Glasgow, and the Bishops of Dunkeld, Galloway, and Murray respectively, were arraigned in the Assembly for irregularities ranging from high immoralities down to mere neglect of duty. With the wayward eccentric Bishop of Galloway there was an old quarrel, and where so much offence was taken, there probably was foundation for part of it. A series of charges was uttered against him, which only harmonise too well with his burlesque prayer for Queen Mary. One charge against him was: “Sixthly, the said Mr Alexander, being one of the pretended Privy Council after the horrible slaughter of Matthew, Earl of Lennox, regent to our sovereign lord of good memory, gave thanks for the same, and other sicklike, openly in the pulpit, to God, and exhorted the people to do the same, saying it was God’s most just judgment that fell upon him; and as God then began to exercise His most just judgment upon him, He would not fail to execute the same upon the rest, comparing oftentimes our said sovereign lord, his regent, and true lieges, to Pharaoh and wicked Absalom, and himself to Moses and David, whom God would defend.”²

He put these denunciations at contemptuous defiance, and the provoked Assembly commanded him “to make public repentance in sackcloth upon ane Sunday in the Kirk of Edinburgh, another Sunday in Holyroodhouse, and the third Sunday in the Queen’s College of St Cuthbert’s.” This doom was to be announced “in the Cathedral Kirk of Quhitthorn, upon a Sunday in the time of public preaching;” and the penalty for disobedience was to be excommunication.³ But the bishop, who would easily find protection among his own people, the Gordons of the north, kept silently aloof, and retained the revenues of his see untouched.

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 294.

² Ibid, 274.

³ Ibid., 282.

We can easily understand that a man of this kind would be liable to correction from his superiors, whoever they were. But we may infer that the proceedings against the other three bishops were rather in warfare than in zeal for order and justice—and that for a palpable reason. They were the only active bishops of the period, being the only members of their order who attended the Assemblies. The charges against the bishops were more numerous than those against any other members of the Church at large; and we must suppose that the sinners among the clergy comprised the whole of the higher order, and only a small percentage of the other.

There was much restlessness in the meetings of Assembly, about the nature and lawfulness of the office of Bishop, as well as the men then holding it. Their powers and duties were limited to those of the Superintendents, whose functions, as we have seen, were not so distinct as a historian finds to be desirable.¹

Some definite conclusion appears to be approaching on the questions, "Whether if the bishops, as they are now in the Kirk of Scotland, has their functions of the Word of God or not; or if the Chapter appointed for creating of them ought to be tolerated in the Reformed Kirk?"²

There was large discussion on these united questions; but a final judgment on them was postponed to take its place in a new general scheme of Church polity, on which the leaders of the Assembly were to be busy for a few years. The prevailing reasons for a final reconstruction of the ecclesiastical system were the sins of the land and the persecution of the professors of the true faith abroad. Through all the restless movements of the Scots Church at that time we can see the exciting influence of the deeds of St Bartholomew's Day. The slaughtered martyrs were essentially their own brethren in Christ—the very founders of that ecclesiastical and religious system which they had taken over with scarce a shade of difference. The Assembly, in reference to "the lamentable writing from the

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 294.

² Ibid., 340.

French Kirk exiled in England to the Kirk of Scotland, bewailing their sorrowful estate and condition," were busied in collecting funds for the Huguenots who had fled to London for protection. Among the leaders of the Church were scholars who had wandered abroad from one seat of learning to another. They were the close friends of the leaders among the persecuted Protestants, had held sweet conference with many of the martyrs, and had themselves passed through many dangers.

The natural leader of the Church after Knox's death was his coadjutor, John Craig. He had been a wanderer over Europe, and had so many strange adventures associated with his name, that in the traditions of the faithful some of them took the shape of supernatural intervention for the safety of so precious a life.¹ We have met him in the critical business of the preliminaries to Queen Mary's third marriage, and we shall find him connected with the contests between Crown and Church in the earlier years of King James's own personal government. He was, however, a man advanced in years, and the leadership gradually passed over to his young coadjutor, Andrew Melville. By birth and original rank both these men stood in a higher position than Knox. With the social advantages thus held by him, Melville, arrived fresh from the schools of Paris, made his first appearance in the Assembly in 1574. Knox had a respect for hereditary

¹ He had made his escape from Rome; and "when he had travelled some days, declining the highways out of fear, he came into a forest, a wild and desolate place, and being sore wearied lay down among some bushes at the side of a little river to refresh himself. He lay there pensive and full of thought. For neither knew he in what place he was, nor had he any means to carry him out of the way. In the mean time there came a dog fawning upon him with a purse in his teeth with money, and lays it down before him. He stricken with fear rises up, but construing the same to proceed from God's favourable providence, he accepted of it, and held on his way, till he came to Vienna, in Austria."—"Satan's Invisible World Discovered," by George Sinclair, Professor of Philosophy and Mathematics in the University of Glasgow, p. 156. This story appears in rather awkward company, since the object of the professor is to set forth leading cases to the point of Satanic influences.

rank which only yielded to a higher duty, when, as the successor of the prophets of old, he had to announce the law of God even to the highest. Melville, though born to a higher position, was more of the leveller. He was the type of a class who, to as much of the fierce fanaticism of the Huguenots as the Scots character could receive, added the stern classical republicanism of Buchanan. Knox and Buchanan were each the chief of a class of thinkers who left to their Church a double, or rather a combined legacy, of which it may be said that the forms and expressed opinions came from the Churchman, but the inner spirit came from the teaching of the scholar, as more in harmony with the national temper. When we add to these influences a portion of The Puritanism becoming prevalent in England, it will be felt that there were then in Scotland elements sufficiently strong to impress on the Church the special marks of its peculiar career.

Before turning to other events which have to be told in their order before the ecclesiastical narrative is resumed, it may be proper to note a project by the Regent's government, from which there arose hopes, not fully realised, of improvement in the secular condition of the clergy. We have seen how it was the grief of the ordinary working ministers, that while their stipends were small, there were countless impediments against their drawing even what was by law assigned to them. The remedy devised by the Regent's government had too much of the character of a complicated form of legal procedure to be told to advantage. The object of all was, however, that the Crown should draw the whole funds and pay the clergy their respective shares of it. The individual clergyman, in endeavouring to raise his dues from members of the territorial aristocracy more or less powerful, had to contend with difficulties which could easily be subdued by the power of the Crown. There was a general grumbling about the measure, importing that it profited the regent's revenue but not the clergy. It may easily be believed that the whole fund so collected was not distributed; indeed there is little doubt that by such a centralised

collection the position of the clergy might have been in some measure improved, even although a considerable portion of the realised money passed into the public revenue.¹

¹ David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, a popular clergyman, in a sermon "preached before the regent and nobility," and published in 1572, thus described the pecuniary position of the Church: "The same accusations and complaints that God used of auld by His prophet against the Jews, serve this day against them that are like the Jews in transgression, yea, they serve against us; for this day Christ is spulyied among us, quhile that whilk ought to maintain the ministry of the Kirk and the poor is given to profane men, flatterers in Court, ruffians and hirelings—the poor in the mean time oppressed, the kirks and temples decaying for lack of ministers and upholding, and the schools utterly neglected and overseen."—P. 72. On another occasion he says more specifically: "The greatest number of us have lived in great penury, without all stipend, some twelve month, some eight, and some half a year, having nothing in the mean time to sustain ourselves and our families but that which friends have given us, and that which we have borrowed from charitable persons, until God send it us to repay them."—Tracts by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline; Bannatyne Club, p. 11.

CHAPTER LVII.

EXPIRY OF THE REGENCY.

PEACE AND A STRONG GOVERNMENT—PROSPERITY—REVENUE—ENFORCEMENT OF CROWN RIGHTS—STORY OF THE RECOVERY OF THE CROWN JEWELS—MORTON'S DIFFICULTIES—HIS POWER TREMBLING—QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CUSTODY OF THE KING—A PARLIAMENT IN STIRLING CASTLE—THE KING ACCEPTS THE "REGIMENT"—A GREAT RECONCILIATION BANQUET—THE SUSPICIOUS DEATH OF ATHOLE—DEATH OF THE DUKE OF CHATELHERAULT—BREAKING UP OF THE HAMILTON POWER—ESME STEWART OF AUBIGNE COMES FROM FRANCE—DIFFICULTIES ABOUT HIS RELIGION—SETTLED BY CONFORMITY—HIS ALARMING INFLUENCE—MISSION OF BOWES TO DEAL WITH IT—RISE OF CAPTAIN JAMES STEWART—HIS SERVICES IN ASSAILING MORTON—THE STRUGGLE—MORTON CRUSHED—HIS TRIAL AND EXECUTION—THE FUTILE PROJECTS—THE RAID OF RUTHVEN—THE FALL OF AUBIGNE—KING JAMES AND BOWES IN CONFERENCE—THE "ASSOCIATION" PROJECT—NEGOTIATION BETWEEN BOWES AND RUTHVEN ABOUT THE CASKET LETTERS—BREAKING UP OF THE RUTHVEN POWER.

FOR five years the land was ruled with such a steady firmness as it had scarcely felt since the best days of James V. The community was waxing fat and becoming supercilious. The councillors of Queen Elizabeth wisely desisted from interference, and limited their communications to the interest which one friend takes in another's welfare. Only one little incident, called the Raid of the Redeswire, seemed likely to disturb the friendship of the two nations. In July 1575, Forster, the warden on the English, and Carmichael the warden on the Scots side of the Border, were holding a warden's court in the debatable land on the Redes-

wire—a boggy elevation, from which the waters trickle on the one side into Northumberland, and on the other into Roxburgh. These courts were held to decide on international claims by the Borderers, whether arising in questions about property or of personal injury. Those who had hereditary feuds to fight out, or recent injuries to avenge, thus met each other face to face. As they were fully armed for what is in courtesy called “self-defence,” there was thus a concentration of hostile elements powerfully combustible. It is said that a dispute arose concerning the balance of a cross account of slaughters and spoliations on either side between the Croziers of Liddesdale and the Fenwicks of Northumberland. By another account, the Scots gave up the malefactors on their side; but when those Scots taken in England were demanded, the warden said there had been enough done for that day—he would give up his prisoners at some other time.¹

The English were the first to break the peace. The Scots fell back before them till they were joined by friends; and then, being the stronger party, they drove the enemy some miles into England with loss of life. Twenty-five of the English were slain, one of them Sir George Heron, the head of an eminent Border house. The English warden himself, Sir Francis Russell, the Earl of Bedford, and several other Englishmen of note, were led away as prisoners. The regent detained them for some days in hospitable imprisonment in his Castle of Dalkeith.² He wrote to Queen Elizabeth on the very day after the misfortune, at once taking the position of the party entitled to complain. He gave the following account of the affair: “After meeting, and good justice and redress in the beginning, at last some question falling betwixt the officers, although without any actual offer of injuries by way of deed on our men’s parts, the disordered people of Tyne-dale, Redesdale, and others, your highness’s subjects, violating the proclamation of truce, by shot of pistols and arrows presently slew two Scotsmen, even in the sight and

¹ Diurnal of Occurrents, 340.

² Life of King James the Sext, 153.

very near the officers, pursuing the remnant of our people so outrageously, that they, being far driven from their standing, at length in their defence, after the slaughter and hurting of sundry gentlemen and others of this nation, your majesty's subjects have happened in the end to receive such loss and detriment as I am heartily sorry for." He has himself earnestly sought peace on his side; and he appeals to her majesty to charge her officers on the frontier, "straightly commanding them the observance of the peace and good amity, and inhibiting all inordinate attempts tending to the violating thereof."¹

It was natural that the English Government should take a different view of the affair. In fact it created considerable wrath in the Court of Queen Elizabeth, and there was to be a diplomatic contest, with Killigrew sent as ambassador to Scotland. Morton did not offer a satisfactory excuse for detaining the warden—he no doubt thought it well to keep his hand on a valuable hostage until he could see his way out of the difficulty. A meeting was proposed between Morton and Lord Huntingdon on the part of England. There arose the old jealous questions about the place of meeting. Morton was audacious enough to demand that it should be on the Scots side of the Border. This was in consideration of his personal rank as governor of the country; but then Huntingdon was of the blood-royal, and this might count as an equivalent. It was agreed to hold the meeting on the Border, and the dispute was adjusted. This affair showed that the honour of the country was in good keeping in the hands of the stern Morton. He had address enough to distribute such gifts as are not the less acceptable, that instead of vulgar bribery they partake of the nature of high-bred courtesy. Sir Robert Bowes thought it of sufficient importance to be especially intimated to Cecil, that "the regent had sent forth four casts of Scottish falcons, whereof two casts are to come to my Lord of Leicester, one to my Lord of Hunsdon, and one to yourself."²

¹ Harington's *Nugæ Antiquæ*, ii. 128. ² Bowes's Correspondence, 77.

The regent made many and powerful enemies by his rigid enforcement of the rights of the Crown. The most formidable of all, however, arose out of a curious train of little events connected with the fate of some of the Crown jewels. The quantity of precious commodities which had accumulated through various sources in the hands of Queen Mary seems to have far excelled the collection of similar treasures belonging to English royalty. It has been difficult in many cases to decide whether the estates in the possession of a sovereign are held by him as representing the nation, or are private property which he can dispose of at his pleasure. The same question is still more apt to arise about valuable movables, such as jewellery. That "the honours of Scotland"—the crown, the sceptre, and the sword—belonged to the nation, there could be no doubt. These remained in Scotland when the miscellaneous Crown jewels followed the Court to London in 1603. On the other hand, the many precious gifts which the queen had received from her French kindred must be esteemed her own property. On the treasury of a Queen-Dowager of France which she brought home with her there might be more doubt—its final disposal might be ruled by special customs. And what, it may be asked, was the position of the trophies of Bannockburn taken from Strathbogie, where they were sent for security by their owners, the Chapter of the Cathedral of Aberdeen?

The jewellery and other precious movables handed over by the queen to Bothwell have been calculated as worth in their day the equivalent of £6000 of our present money.¹ These seem to have been nearly all recovered on his flight.²

¹ Robertson's Inventories, cxxvi.

² In 1573 Cecil sent certain queries to Morton about the grants of Queen Mary to Bothwell, and one of the answers is, "He had delivered to him of the queen's jewels to the value of 20 or 30,000 crowns." On this George Chalmers remarks, "That the assertion or the affidavit of such a miscreant as the Earl of Morton, who was devoid of principle and faithless from habit, was unworthy of any credit."—*Life of Mary Queen of Scots*, iii. 83. This exhibition of his duty as a vindicator was unnecessary. How Queen Mary endowed Bothwell before the marriage (see chapter xlv.) is of moment, as

Queen Elizabeth's emissary, Throckmorton, in his newsletter to his mistress about the adjustment of the regency, reiterates that Queen Mary besought Murray "to take her jewels, and all she hath of value, into his custody, for otherwise she is sure neither she nor her son shall have good of them."¹ The custody of these possessions must have naturally been ordered by Murray as regent. It became known that he had parted with some of them to Queen Elizabeth for a considerable sum of money. The estimate of this transaction has vibrated according to the views of those dealing with it. At one end it is parting with the public property for the support of the Government; at the other it is a piece of larceny, in which Murray is the spoiler and Queen Elizabeth the receiver of stolen goods. Queen Mary eagerly watched her treasure, remonstrating bitterly when she had suspicions of its disposal. She did thus not for the indulgence of pomp or avarice. Her French dower and her jewels were to be her military chest, if she should again set foot in Scotland. When Grange held the castle in her cause, the result was realised as to the jewels; for everything valuable, whether it belonged to the Crown or to the exiled queen, was kept there as the chief national fortress. Grange from time to time raised money by "wadding" or pawning these treasures. They were thus dispersed in France and England; and many of them were in Edinburgh, in the hands of speculative goldsmiths, who then did a business in which they combined the banker and the pawnbroker of modern days. When the castle was taken, there was a strict inquiry as to the disposal of the treasure it was known to

affecting her intentions, and the question of her guilt; but what Bothwell got possession of when he was lord of all, cannot be fairly charged against her. Joseph Robertson, in editing Queen Mary's Inventories, found confirmation of Morton's statement: "Sir Robert Melville of Murdocairny, in an examination before the Justice-Clerk and others in October 1573, bore testimony that a certain man at arms 'was with the Earl Bothwell when he fled away to Orkney, show this deponent that the Earl Bothwell said they have gotten of his within the castle, a jewell whilk the queen had given him, better nor xx^m crowns.'"—Preface xcvi. See end of chapter lii.

¹ Keith, ii. 738.

have contained. A large portion including "the honours" was found hidden in a cleft of the castle rock, perhaps in the fond hope that they might be recovered when the fortress again fell to the queen's party. Grange, in the interval between his capture and execution, was searchingly examined as to what he had done with the valuables amissing. He was irritated by the suspicion that he had concealed some of them in his clothing, but such an act does not assimilate with the defects of his character.¹

For the recovery of these treasures it was considered

¹ There is something of the sordidly humiliating in the explanations extracted from the chivalrous hero about these transactions. It would appear that a portion of the jewellery had been pawned to a certain James Mosman, a citizen of Edinburgh, who maintained that he had restored them at the juncture of the rendering of the castle, though they were not found by the captors. Grange explained the matter thus: "The jewels laid in wad to James Mosman he alleges he delivered to me again the day I rendered the castle in the General Sir William Drury's hands. It is of truth the said James gave me certain gear in an evil-favoured clout. What was in it, God is my witness, I saw not; but whatsoever it was he gave me, I came therewith to the chamber where then I did lie, in the which at that time there was both Englishmen and Scotchmen, and cast it in an open coffer, and commanded one of my own that was standing by to lock the said coffer. But what has become of it since I know not: for my coffers were all left in my chamber, I thinking the same to be sure, because it was given me to understand that the general had gotten grant of all that was within it to my behoof, otherwise I might have provided for sundry things that I have lost. And that was because I feared the general should have inquired me on my honour if I had either jewels on me or gold; which truly if he had I would have declared the truth unto him. And therefore for that respect I brought out nothing with me but the clothes was on me, and four crowns in my purse, as I will answer to my God. For had I believed he had not gotten all that was in my chamber, nor yet inquired me on my honour, I should have saved a great deal more nor I have done, both of jewels and of mine own proper goods. For not only baith my wife and my daughter's children lost their own clothing, with some small jewels to the value of a thousand crowns, but as well a good part of mine own stuff and clothing; for my coffers were opened and searched through or they came out at the gates, which I could have remedied if I had not thought myself assured that all that was in my said chamber had not been promised unto the general by the regent. This above written I do by this my handwritt affirm to be true."—Robertson's Inventories, clii., cliii.

necessary to strengthen Morton's hands by an Act of Parliament. It described them as "sometime pertaining to the queen our sovereign lord's mother, and now pertaining to his majesty since his highness's coronation." They are described as having fallen into the hands of "divers the subjects of this realm and others," who make daily traffic with them.¹ It has been, oddly enough, among the items filling up the charge of extortion and injustice against Morton, that when he exacted restoration of the jewels he did not repay the money for which they were pledged. But surely the payment by the victorious of the debts incurred by the conquered party has not then or ever been so common a practice that the neglect of it can be counted a crime.

We now come to the point at which his activity and determination in recovering these possessions of the Crown boded danger to the Regent.

The widow of the Regent Murray was among those called to account for having crown jewels in their possession. It has naturally been maintained, and cannot be disproved, that she obtained them by her husband's connivance. She and Mary Fleming—one of the queen's Maries, and the widow of Lethington—were peculiarly pertinacious and successful in resisting all efforts to deprive them of their prize. Murray's widow had become the wife of the powerful Earl of Argyle. Still Morton was determined to have restitution of her plunder; for among its items was a wondrous diamond called "the great Harry," because it was a gift to Queen Mary from her father-in-law, King Henry II. of France. It was afterwards, on its removal to London, set with other jewels in a group called "the Mirror of Great Britain."² The countess, or her husband in her name, fought a hard battle for the retention of the jewels. The Privy Council issued repeated orders that they should be delivered. The countess appealed to Parliament, and harassed Queen Elizabeth to interpose for her. The ground on which that queen could appropri-

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 74.

² Robertson's Inventories, cxxxviii.

ately meddle in such a matter was, that the jewels were a provision for the daughters of her old ally the regent. Morton, thus beset, appears at one time to have proposed a compromise, but it came to no practical issue. At last, on the 5th of March 1575, Argyle had to submit to the humiliation of appearing before the Privy Council and delivering up "ane great H. of diamond, with ane ruby pendant thereat; six other jewels, thereof three diamonds, and the other three rubies, intromitted with and kept by the said Dame Agnes and her said spouse since the decease of the said umwhile Earl of Murray."¹ Such was the making of one potent enemy.

It was destined that a Highland feud, breaking out a year afterwards, was to be coupled along with the affair of the jewels among the chief causes of a political revolution. A certain reiver of the Argyle country, called Alister Glass, *alias* MacCallum, chose to turn aside from the Lowland districts, which were the legitimate field of Highland plunder, and drive a "creach" from the braes of Athole. He was caught and brought to the earl's feudal court, where he was speedily condemned to be hanged. MacCallum Mohr—known to the Saxon as Earl of Argyle—took an interest in the lesser MacCallum, and pleaded with the Earl of Athole for his life. The small favour was granted. Alister, however, offended again in worse fashion than before, and discussion and recrimination made bad blood between the two clans. The quarrel became so deep that the head of each house took it to himself, and each levied an army to prepare for war. Morton, like the strict disciplinarian who will allow no quarrelling, threatened to spoil their contest by the presence of a superior force, and cited both the leaders to appear before the Council and answer for their conduct as disturbers of the king's peace. He had permitted the feud to go so far that he could hang a charge of treason over their heads, and each thought it best to remain within his Highland fastness. One of them had just felt the weight of the regent's hand, and both knew that, if once in his power, he would strip

¹ Robertson's Inventories, cxxxviii.

them of something valuable. It occurred to them, therefore, that it would be wise to close their strife and make common cause with the other enemies of the regent, now becoming numerous. Among other sources of revenue, he had opened one only available to strong governments—the revocation of grants of the domains of the Crown made contrary to the provisions of the Act for the preservation of the Crown lands.

Among others, he set his eye on a desirable estate which had been gifted by the queen to Mary Livingston, one of her four Maries. Her husband had gone so far in preparation for vengeance, that a conviction was obtained against him and an accomplice for conspiring to put the regent to death.¹ The persons who might be amenable to the pressure of a strong government able to inflict the law to its letter were very numerous. Uneasy surmises of various kinds were afloat. It was not easy then, nor is it so now, to fathom the designs of that inscrutable man, bold, crafty, practical in design, speedy in action, and unmolested by any scruples of conscience. It was observed that on some public armorial bearings the heart and mullions of the Douglas appeared where the royal lion might have been more aptly blazoned. It was remembered, at the same time, that if not the genealogical chief, he was practically the head of that formidable house of Douglas which had repeatedly shaken the throne.

The chronicler of the day who notices these things tells how he constructed the trap in which he was himself caught. He projected that favourite scheme of desperate plotters in Scotland—getting possession of the royal boy.

It will be remembered, that although the head of the executive government, he was still the servant of the Estates of the realm. These had jealously placed the prince in the hands of another servant, with the means of protecting the boy in a strong fortress. Erskine, his guardian, the governor of the castle, seems to have kept Morton aloof; and we find him nervously anxious and inquisitive about the doings there, and trying to get them

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, i. 71.

kept right through Erskine's nephew and his own cousin the Laird of Lochleven, to whom he complains, "we are evil and unthankfully acquit for our goodwill borne to the house of Mar."¹ He could be admitted within the gate of Stirling Castle only as a visitor, like Argyle, Athole, or any other among the eminent nobility. On such a visit, one day in September 1577, he had a conversation with the king, who, it will be observed, was then twelve years old. He professed himself to be an old man weary with the cares of State. He saw in his royal master one young in years, but in sage counsel old. It was time that the country should have the benefit of his genius. Would he take the government on himself, and relieve his poor servant? It was hard that the monarch of all should be confined to one lonely castle. If a free king, he might "be well lodged in the Castle of Edinburgh, baith for the good situation of the house, the pleasant sight of the fields, and the sight of the sea and frequency of ships." The boy babbled of what had been so said to him. According to contemporary accounts, Argyle and Athole resolved to seize the opportunity; and we find from Morton's correspondence that both were then in Stirling Castle, not much to his content.² Whoever suggested it, it was determined to strike a blow. On the king's own word it was known that Morton had desired to be relieved of his responsibility. They concluded that "in respect he had done so good service to his majesty in time bygone, it was no reason to refuse him of such a lawful petition." By order of the Privy Council the event was proclaimed with all heraldic pomp, blowing of trumpets, and firing of

¹ Registrum Honoris de Morton, i. 89.

² Ibid., i. 88. It troubled and alarmed him to hear that Argyle was living in the castle. When he grumbled about a person charged with treason being so near the king, he was told that Mar gave Argyle an apartment by his majesty's order. To this Morton says, "What it shall please his grace to command shall also please us;" but this thing had not been the pleasure of his majesty in the right sense, for it was an evil act tending to his own prejudice, and therefore a thing he would not do "without he be sinisterly persuaded so to do."—Ibid.

cannon. The news spread as an event for national rejoicing. Morton at once felt that the current was too strong for him, and did not face it. He held Edinburgh Castle for a few days ; and on this point it must be said of one who has an evil name in history, that his conduct seems to have been worthy and honest. At great exertion and the earning of much hatred he had recovered the Crown jewels and other national property. If the castle were snatched from him, all would be thrown loose ; the Crown property would be again pillaged, and he would be unable to vindicate his own integrity by showing how much of it he had recovered, and how well he had kept what was brought together. He desired that the treasures in the castle should be inventoried, and that time should be allowed for that being done. It was done ; and there is no hint that the result was unsatisfactory, or that Morton had acted otherwise than as an honest guardian of the public property.¹

He was finally relieved of his responsibilities with the profuseness of legal formality peculiar to State transactions in Scotland. Two long documents, extended through all the variations of stipulation and condition which the ingenuity of jealous conveyancers could invent, contained obligations by the young king and the assembled nobles to hold him indemnified for his conduct as regent ; two others of similar character contained their discharge for the castle and its contents ; and the whole were to be afterwards ratified in Parliament. A council of twelve

¹ "The brute is here, that they mind to gar charge the castle to be delivered under the pain of treason. If that shall be done, the king will receive great hurt therethrough ; for if I should deliver the castle upon a charge, the goods therein not being inventoried, it were, no doubt, his majesty's great apparent hurt, and altogether my wreck. For other men might at their pleasure possess and use his jewels and other things, whilk I have with great labour recovered and to this time well kept. I pray you, spare no travail to stop this at your utmost power ; for neither reason, care, nor conscience can agree with this order."—Morton to Angus ; *Registrum Honoris de Morton*, i. 105. And to his cousin, the Laird of Lochleven : "It is my rack that is sought, and a great hurt to the king, if his jewels, movables, and munition should be delivered without inventory."—*Ibid.*, 103.

was appointed, by whose sanction all the business of the Crown was to be transacted. Six were to be a quorum, of whom the chancellor must always be one. The Lord Glamis, who held that high office, had just been slain in a feudal quarrel, and he was succeeded by Athole.¹

We find Morton saying to his cousin, "I would be at that point, to have nothing ado now but to live quietly, to serve my God and the king my master."² But the great stake, the possession of the boy, could still be played for; and perhaps he considered that such a game was in the way of both duties. Whether or not it was by skill or chance, it came to pass that the boy fell into Morton's hands. We have seen that his guardian and the governor of Stirling Castle was Alexander Erskine, the brother of the late Regent Mar. His nephew, the Earl of Mar, a youth about twenty years old, lived in the castle. He either adopted or was talked into the opinion that, as head of the house of Mar, the custody both of the castle and of the young king belonged to himself. Sir Robert Bowes, writing to Burleigh, describes a scene in the castle, in which the lay Abbots of Dryburgh and of Cambuskenneth—both Erskines—acted along with the young earl. It occurred on the 26th of April 1578. The three managed, on pretence of passing out on a hunting expedition, to find the master unprotected near the gate, and tried by bullying or force to make him render up the keys of the castle, on the ground that Mar, the heir of the house, was the rightful commander of the fortress. He managed to seize a halberd and summon aid. There was then a fray, in which the master's son was crushed to death; but it had no other conclusion. Argyle, also an inmate of the castle, interposed; and, as Bowes understood, the others at length "agreed to remove thence and draw to concord, especially to satisfy the king, who of the tumult (as is reported) was in great fear, and teared his hair, saying the master

¹ Life of King James the Sext, 160-164; *Registrum Honoris de Morton*.

² *Registrum Honoris de Morton*, 163.

was slain; and (as I am informed) his grace by night hath been by this means so discouraged as in his sleep he is therewith greatly disquieted.”¹

Bowes was mistaken in his supposition that Morton had been beaten. When the Privy Council appeared to have audience, the gate was closed on them as a body, and they could only get admission singly as guests. There was now a confused struggle, in which the timid boy, the cause of all, might aptly be said to have been hustled and dragged this way and that by the selfish scramblers. The chances of a civil war were so imminent, that at one time the opposition lords brought six or seven thousand men together encamped at Falkirk. The interposition of Bowes, the English minister, seems to have done much to save the nation from actual war. In the words of his friend Lord Hunsdon, “If they had met together, it had been so bloody a day as would not have been quenched in Scotland these many years; and only stayed by the great diligence and extreme travail of Mr Bowes, who deserves great commendation for the same.”²

In the midst of all this confusion a Parliament was summoned. It did not suit the views of Morton to hold it in Edinburgh, hence it was to assemble in the great hall within Stirling Castle. This, on the other hand, was displeasing, and indeed alarming, to the adverse party, who protested that a meeting of the Estates held within a fortress commanded by an enemy of his country was no free Parliament. It transacted a considerable amount of business, however, as the statute-book shows. The leading Act was “the ratification of the acceptance of the regiment upon the king’s majesty in his own person.” Another was a discharge in Morton’s favour, relieving him from all responsibility or liability to be questioned concerning “the administration of his regiment, Castle of Edinburgh, munition, jewels, and others being therein.”

When the storm blew over, a grand reconciliation

¹ Bowes to Burleigh, 28th April 1578; Correspondence, 6.

² Bowes’s Correspondence, 11.

banquet was held in the Castle of Stirling. Immediately afterwards, Athole, the chancellor, died suddenly, in great agony, and his friends said that his enemy had contrived in the arrangements of the festival to have him helped to a dose of poison. Morton solemnly denied this in his last confession; and it is one of the things which seem doomed to remain a mystery until the day when all secrets are laid bare. There is strong testimony to the firm and sound condition of Scotland in the harmlessness of this formidable contest to the vital interests of the country. In the days of insecurity and mighty risks and terrors, which but a few years had passed over, such an affair might have been spoken of as involving the safety of Elizabeth's throne and the Protestant ascendancy in England. It might have pointed to issues affecting the balance of powers all over Europe; and now it could be treated as little more important than a local squabble.

Morton, his actual power virtually re-established, found immediate congenial work in the destruction of an enemy's house. The house of Hamilton had lost a great portion of the power that had made it formidable. The head of the house, "the Duke," died in the spring of 1575. He has held a considerable place in our History; but he was conspicuous less as a real actor than by the floundering and collisions caused by his inability to steer through practical life that great wealth and influence with which fortune had endowed him. Whether justly or not, the Government of France held that his rights then died with him; and the dukedom of Chatelherault, with its domains and honours, returned to the Crown. His eldest son succeeded him as Earl of Arran. We have met him playing those fantastic tricks which were so grotesquely mixed up with the sterner purposes of Bothwell. He was now detained an irretrievable maniac, who for several years could have done neither good nor evil to any public cause; yet in him was vested the bulk of the estates that would change hands by forfeiture. They were in the custody of his two younger brothers, John, Commendator of Arbroath, and Claud, Commendator of Paisley. The only one of the Hamiltons who, according

to extant records, was tried in a court of justice, was "Arthur Hamilton in Bothwellhaugh," a brother, apparently, of the murderer of Murray. He was charged with accession to that crime, but acquitted on condition that he should "nowise resett, supply, intercommune, or show favour to" the two commendators. Against these the war was opened in the High Court of Parliament, the records of which are laden with documents connected with it. These, however divested of the spirit of justice and mercy, are scrupulous in technicality and precision. For their many transgressions the Hamiltons must have been repeatedly "put to the horn"—that is to say, after blast of trumpet, they must have been called by name at the market-cross of Edinburgh, and at the pier and shore of Leith, and required to attend at the Tolbooth to stand trial, otherwise they would be outlawed and declared rebels. Persons so cited and denounced as rebels, on failure to appear, were beyond the protection of the law, and could be dealt with without any further troublesome formality.

But with the air of a generous reliance on the policy of forbearance, the Government declined to profit by this opportunity. It, on the other hand, relaxed the hornings—that is to say, restored the men for the time to the protection of the law, in order that they might come with safety and plead to the charges to be made against them in Parliament. They were summoned; but, as usual, they preferred the safety to be found in their own fortresses to the justice they were likely to receive from Parliament. There is a careful inquiry through pursuivants and witnesses on the technical legality of the citations which they have just defied; and then they are again "put to the horn." All this not being quite sufficient, the same process is repeated for the purpose of duly demanding that they shall yield their fortresses before they are denounced as traitors. Along with all this there are the elaborate preparations by the citation of witnesses, and the drawing of multitudinous documents for the trial which was never to be. The brothers diligently fortified their two chief castles of Hamilton in

Lanarkshire, and Draffen in Fifeshire. Next a solemn commission was issued, narrating all their offences, and the efforts made to bring them to trial, and concluding with the royal authority to seize them in their strongholds.

This document deals elaborately with a difficulty not, as it would appear, easily overcome. The Hamiltons and the queen's party would not join in the treaty or pacification of 1572 without an indemnity for the past. It was proposed by the king's party to except from that indemnity the murderers of the two regents. It was the advice of Queen Elizabeth, who was referred to, that this matter should stand over until the king could deal with it himself. As the king himself is now made to tell the story, it was agreed "that the inquisitions, searches, and revenges, by justice or otherwise, of the said two murders, should be suspended, deferred, and put over until such time as we should be of that age as by the laws and customs of our realm we should take the government to ourself." That time, it was held, had now come. The commission to seize the Hamiltons in their strongholds was issued on the 1st of May 1579. The scene now changes from the technicalities of the Tolbooth to a short war. Hamilton Castle, which seems in some measure to have been restored after it was ruined by Drury, and the other were besieged. They made but brief resistance, and only subordinates were found in them: the principal birds had flown, John, the elder of the two brothers, escaping through England to France disguised as a soldier. Again we are in the technicalities. A carefully-drawn and elaborate Act of the Estates was passed, indemnifying the commissioners for what they had done, and pronouncing it to be all good and lawful service to his majesty. Another Act gave authority for the destruction of the castles. Finally, an Act of forfeiture completed the transaction.¹

At the same time occurred an event of a different character—the arrival in Scotland of a stranger who was destined to have a notable and not a wholesome influence on the future destiny of Scotland. This was Esmé Stewart,

¹ See the documents at length, Act. Parl., iii. 159-162.

Lord of Aubigné, in France, the son of a brother of old Lennox, the father of Henry Darnley. His age is not known ; but it must have exceeded thirty, since he had a son fifteen years old.¹ He was a trained French courtier, and therefore immediately eyed with jealous aversion. We have seen that even in the days when the ancient league was in its strength, the Scots could ill bear with an emissary of the French Court, even though he were a descendant of their own royal house. Whatever changes had come over that Court only made it more offensive to the rough Scots. It had degenerated even since their queen had been trained there in the evil practices for which they had driven her from her throne. It was a period of crime and folly lying between the two heroic periods of Francis I. and Henry IV. It was well typified in the Italian Bianci, who, as a skilful chemist, held the double functions of Court perfumer and Court poisoner. To the Protestants, now the great bulk of the community, the stranger represented the accursed city whose streets were wet with the blood of the saints. He was of course a Papist. It was rumoured that he was intimate with the bloody house of Guise—that an eminent person of that house had accompanied him to the ship in which he had sailed for Scotland. Nothing can be more likely. But it is not necessary that we should adopt a conclusion which the frightened clergy drew from this conjunction—the conclusion that he was sent as an emissary from these Guises to allure the land back to Popery. It may be held that the Guises, if they were not too sagacious to have attempted such an enterprise, would have put it into apter hands. The Lord of Aubigné's resources were those of the idle ornamental courtier only, not of the practical statesman.

But to men too sagacious to see danger in him either as a practical statesman or a secret emissary of the Pope, there soon arose grounds of suspicion that his influence would be malign. He could tell how the French king was supreme and absolute, as a monarch ought to be,

¹ Douglas' Peerage, ii. 100.

and pour the principles of divine right and passive obedience into ears too ready to receive them. All such doctrines were still eminently offensive to the landed gentry and burgesses, who stood by the old supremacy of the three Estates.

The young king at once took the glittering stranger to his bosom, dazzled, as it would appear, by a meteor so much brighter than the dim satellites surrounding him. In some measure, perhaps, the stranger's influence at Court may have proceeded from this, that his rank as a relation of the royal house opened a freer intercourse than it was deemed becoming for the king to hold with the ordinary nobility.

That in the time of innocent boyhood he should thus impetuously have thrown his affections on a stranger, was afterwards, when his confidences became more questionable, referred to as an index to his nature, which required another's will to be his absolute director. An acute and lively writer, looking back from the favourites of his later days to this, the earliest of all, says: "I pray the reader to consider the sweetness of this king's nature; for I ascribe it to that cause, that from the time he was fourteen years old, and no more—that is, when the Lord Aubigny came into Scotland out of France to visit him—even then he began, and with that noble personage, to clasp some one gratioſo in the embraces of his great love, who was unto him as a *parelius*,—that is, when the sun finds a cloud so fit to be illustrated by his beams that it looks almost like another sun."¹

The glory of the stranger was exhibited in a royal progress through the country, at pageants given to the young king. They bear a monotonous resemblance to those exhibited before his mother, when she, too, was young, and seemed to have before her a great career. These pageants were not merely costly in themselves, but were accompanied by "propines" or gifts offered to the sovereign. As the favourite was ever with him on these

¹ *Scrinia Reserata* : Hacket's Memorial of Archbishop Williams, D.D., 39.

occasions, and very prominent, his presence and the drain of money to supply the Court pageantry were naturally coupled together as cause and effect. Through all this the brilliant young stranger did not conceal the sense that he was moving among barbarians. A wise political emissary would not thus have wantonly provoked a proud and fierce gentry; and his foolish conduct might have well acquitted him of deep designs, had he not made men too angry to be reasonable about him. He was speedily endowed with substantial wealth and high honours. The old earldom of Lennox, which descended properly to James himself, as the son of the elder of Earl Matthew's sons, had been vested in the second son, Robert. James wanted it, however, for the new favourite. Robert was content to receive in exchange the earldom of March; and within six months after his arrival from France, on 5th March 1580, the favourite received the earldom of Lennox. It was converted into a dukedom for him on 5th August 1581. This was a rare title in Scotland. Only once for life, and in the exceptional case of Bothwell, made Duke of Orkney, had it been conferred on any one not a direct member of the royal family. And the domains with which he was endowed, scattered over ten counties, would fill a rather tedious inventory. Last, and crown of all favours, he was made governor of Dumbarton Castle, one of the three strongest national fortresses.¹ The excitement he created appears to have set the English emissaries to their old occupation of anticipating astounding events. Among these the stranger was to kidnap the young king, and carry him over to the Guises; while Morton, as a counter-plot, was to inveigle him into his

¹ Morton, writing a very reticent letter to Sir Robert Bowes, with promise of verbal explanation of matters which he only ventured to hint at in writing, says significantly, in reference to this acquisition: "For anything that is likely to work by your mistress here, it is like to follow one of our proverbs—that is, When the steed is stolen, let steek the stable-door. The Earl of Lennox has gotten the keeping of the house of Dumbarton, with all duties and commodities appertaining thereto; and that for the space of one year, and further enduring the king's will."—Bowes's Correspondence, 91.

own strong fortress at Dalkeith, or to sell him to the Queen of England.¹ It was not the least perplexing of all these political phenomena, that Lennox, to remove all difficulties about his offensive religion, frankly, and without giving the slightest trouble in his conversion, avowed himself to have become a Protestant, and joined the visible Church. There were those who, instead of attributing this to utter levity, found in it the greater crime of an over-zealousness for the cause of Rome, which was to be served by an act of profound deceit.

It might have been that in the bud this favourite's prosperous career could have been easily nipped. The opportunity, if it ever had been, was now past. We have seen in the rise of Bothwell how it was possible for the sovereign of Scotland, by connivance with a subject, to raise him to a power dangerous to the country. The process was here repeated; but Lennox was not a murderer, nor did he afford any reason for saying that he aspired to a throne. Hence he did not excite the amount of odium, mingled with fear, that attended the career of Bothwell; and as yet it was found the best policy for all who aspired after office or emolument to court his propitious smile.

Of course there were many schemes to break, or at least balance, his influence. One of these merged into the appointment of a new high officer of State, a Lord High Chamberlain, who, with a vice-chamberlain to assist him, was to command twenty-four young men, the sons of the chief nobles of the realm, selected as a body-guard for the young king. The office was given to Lennox, or, more properly speaking, he took it, and he appointed his twenty-five subordinates.² It thus fell to him to obtain in a constitutional manner that object so often achieved by violence—the custody of the royal person.

Queen Elizabeth and her advisers were very angry at all this, and sent Sir Robert Bowes to Edinburgh to put Scotland to rights. At a meeting of the English Council, held on the 18th of September, the interest that England had to keep down the favourite was set forth in articles

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 28.

² *Ibid.*, 128.

which bear the impress of the sagacious judgment and clear diction of Cecil:—

“1. And first, it is to be noted what are the perils if Lennox be suffered to continue his greatness.

“First, He will abuse all such as bear friendship to the queen’s majesty.

“He will nourish unkindness and troubles upon the Borders, to drive the queen’s majesty to a continual charge to keep force to defend outrages committed upon her subjects.

“He will induce the king to marry in France, or elsewhere, to make himself able to offend the queen’s majesty; and when he shall be of some more years, finding her majesty not assisted with some good friendship, to attempt to make present title, as the queen his mother did when she was married to the Dolphin of France.

“2. And to this enterprise, whensoever he shall attempt it, he shall have more helps than the queen his mother had.

“First, Because he shall be a young man, in whom both the kingdoms of England and Scotland shall seem to be knit, to avoid all perils by uncertainty of succession.

“Secondly, He shall have the comfort of all discontented persons in England, whereof the number is at this day far greater than was in the beginning of the queen’s reign.

“Thirdly, The Scottish nation is at this day stronger in feats of arms than it was aforetime, by reason of their exercise in civil wars at home, and their being abroad in the Low Countries.”¹

This last affords a key to the causes of the failure of the mission, and of all attempts, either by England or France, to interfere in the internal affairs of Scotland. In seven years of peace the country had grown so strong that the leaders of factions could fight their own battles without endangering the independence of the country.

It would be a dry and profitless story to tell how Bowes talked to this one and another, making no progress. But

¹ Bowes’s Correspondence, 120.

some portions of his instructions, and his own efforts to give effect to them, are worth noting. He was to use all means to prevent the favourite from getting Dumbarton Castle into his hands. The emissary did his best, not only by persuasion and bullying, but by tampering with the deputy-governor to get him to hold the castle in defiance of his new lord. There came during his vain endeavours an instruction, that if all other means should fail, "then would her majesty you would confer with the Earl Morton, and other the enemies to the Earl of Lennox, how this matter may be helped, either by laying violent hands on the said earl and his principal associates, in case no other more temperate course may be found for the remedy thereof, or by some other way that by him shall be thought meet, wherein her majesty willeth you to assure them that they shall not lack any assistance she can give them. For which purpose the Lord-Governor of Berwick is appointed presently to repair to his charge, with ample instruction and express commandment to yield any assistance that shall be by them required."¹

But this instruction was revoked in all haste, and with some appearance of trepidation, because "it may be feared that if any violence should be begun, the faction would seize themselves of the person of the king, and carry him to Dumbarton; from whence they might either convey him to France, or (fortifying themselves) they call in foreign aid to his aid, upon pretence of necessary assistance against this violence offered." And this is accompanied with a general hint,—“Be not too hasty to promise much from hence, for we take no care to perform;” an indication that there were those at the English Court who knew the hopelessness of actual interference.²

Bowes was instructed to demand an audience of the king and Council, in order that he might state the whole case against Lennox—an audience from which Lennox himself must be excluded. The reception of this demand will be best told in his own words:—

“Yesterday I returned at the hour prescribed, praying

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, III.

² Ibid., III, 112.

to have audience before himself and his Council, which was granted. After I prayed that the Earl of Lennox might be excluded, for that I have to deliver some matter that particularly touched him; which being proponed in Council, Lennox sitting there, they sent the Laird of Cleishe to me, to understand whether I was a messenger or an ambassador; wherein I referred them to the view of her majesty's own letters to the king, expressing the cause and manner of my several despatch to him now and before. And finding the mark they shot at, I said that by those letters they should find me sent in ambassage. Soon after, the Abbot of St Combe, wholly devoted to Lennox, and the Lord of Cathcart, depending on the Earl of Morton, were sent to me, declaring that the king and Council find it not meet, nor standing with their accustomed order, to remove any nobleman from his seat in Council before sufficient matter should be opened against him; whereon I answered, that her majesty having directed me to make this request, I have therefore done the same, and further, have showed particular and sufficient cause for the king's welfare and advantage for Lennox's removal, besides many other respects more meet to be thankfully remembered by them than presently mentioned by me. Then they demanded whether I had direction in writing. After I had found fault with this kind of dealing, I said that to remove all scruple I had direction in writing on that part. Again they signified to me that the king and Council would see my direction in writing before they removed Lennox, and asked whether it was under her majesty's hand or no. I denied to show that to the whole Council, especially while Lennox was present; nevertheless, for the king's pleasure, I would let him, and such convenient number he should choose, see that part of mine instructions. And to the other part of their demand there needed none answer. This offer was also rejected, with signification to me, that except I would show my direction in writing to the king and whole Council there sitting, I should not be heard. Still I denied to show it in that manner, and likewise I refused to deliver my message before Lennox and that assembly that would

hear me with such a pre-judgment, and had so little regard to her majesty's reasonable request, without satisfaction whereof I would not proceed further with them; praying their determinate resolution to be given me, that I might send the same to her majesty, and dispose myself accordingly. At length they brought me answer that the king and Council would consider and advise further on that matter, and within short time give me understanding of their conclusion. With this I departed, declaring myself nothing contented. And now I attend new day and warning, resting uncertain whether I shall be heard or no, unless I shall either show to Lennox and the rest my said direction written, or else deliver mine errand in the presence of Lennox, contrary her majesty's pleasure. And being determined to agree to neither of these before I shall be otherwise commanded by her majesty, I have therefore thought good to signify these with speed, and humbly to pray speedy direction as well in these as also in all other matters here of such weight and difficulty."¹

Bowes stuck pertinaciously to his point, but without any approach to success—the thing demanded was “not according to the order of this realm.”

The ambassador in the middle of October received an order for his return, with an opening for a reconciliation should the young king express proper contrition for his conduct. The tenor of this amended admonition was, that the Queen of England had been his protector from his childhood and the maker of his fortunes, and he had so far despised her wise counsel, that even while she was imparting it the favourite was raised to the climax of his power. The message of repentance should come by a special and highly-accredited messenger. Here Queen Elizabeth was at her old-established form of trickery—Bowes was to get this done and the proper person selected in such a manner that it should seem to be entirely the spontaneous doing of the young king or of the Scots Court. Bowes thought that Lord Ruthven would make a proper messenger. No doubt he was one of Lennox's

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 116, 117.

followers ; but Bowes thought he saw in him a man who had designs of his own, and events were to prove that he was right. A message was sent, but neither its terms nor the rank of its bearer was satisfactory ; and before the month of December, diplomatic relations between England and Scotland were closed.¹

In the mean time the favourite was making arrangements for confirming Queen Elizabeth's worst fears, and proving that he could be dangerous to his enemies as well as propitious to his friends. His power was insecure while Morton existed ; so Morton must die. In attacking him, the great power of the favourite was added to that of the confederates, who had already been almost strong enough to bring him down. That fruitful source of all the great State prosecutions of the day, the murder of Darnley, furnished the means of his destruction. The favourite and his party secured an able agent or champion to begin the contest. This was James Stewart, a son of Lord Ochiltree. He first appears as "the Captain ;" but in the course of the business in hand he becomes Earl of Arran, having been promoted to the forfeited title of the house of Hamilton and a goodly portion of their estates in the spring of 1581.

The rapid fluctuation of titles at this period is apt to perplex the reader, unless he is careful to keep the individuality of their owners in remembrance. We have had two conspicuous Lennoxes ; here is another Arran, and presently there will come another Bothwell. Stewart's maternal descent gave an appropriate character to the disposal of the forfeited titles and estates of the Hamiltons. His mother was a Hamilton—a sister of the old head of the house, the feeble Duke of Chatelherault.² Arran's

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 142-156.

² "Captain James Stewart of Bothwellmuir, second son of Andrew Lord Ochiltree, whose mother, Lady Margaret Hamilton, was only child of James, first Earl of Arran, by his first wife, Beatrix Drummond." "Captain Stewart had a charter of the earldom of Arran, the baronies of Hamilton and Kinniel, and the other estates of the Hamilton family in the counties of Bute, Lanark, Kirkcudbright, Berwick, and Linlithgow, 22d April 1581 ; and he obtained a letter

precedents were of a kind to recommend him to the support of the Protestants. He was a brother of John Knox's widow. He had fought as a soldier in the Low Country war for the Dutch and against the Spaniards. But his career was of a character not likely to fulfil any expectations so created. That he was a daring and able man this career shows. Historians have spoken of him as a master in all the great vices, and conspicuous even in that age for profligacy. That he was profligate there can be no doubt, since, independently of all contemporary testimony, an act of wickedness was perpetrated on so high a stage as to demand general attention—his seduction of the Lady March, his friend's wife, who afterwards became his own. But in that age, overflowing with wickedness, the rank held in the hierarchy of vice depended fully as much on the loudness of the accusers as on the actual conduct of the accused, and probably Arran had a generic resemblance to most of his neighbours.

According to the account of one of the English spies, he brought his accusation against Morton before the king and Council, after the manner in which Craufurd had denounced Lethington. The scene in this instance was the more exciting of the two; for Lethington was a poor cripple, but Morton was a soldier, and had followers at hand. There was a long wrangling; and indeed it appears to have been a question, which any trifle might decide, whether there should be actual bloodshed. We are told that both Angus, his relation, and Lennox, his enemy, declined to vote on the question before the Council. On consulting the king's advocate, it was decided that he should be "warded" or imprisoned on the charge of treason and murder. This was on the 6th of January 1581. He was, in the first instance, put under guard in his own apartments at Holyrood, and a few days afterwards was removed to the Castle of Edinburgh.¹

of confirmation under the great seal, 28th October 1581, of new ratifying the old erection of the earldom of Arran, and creating him and his heirs-male Earl of Arran, Lord of Avane and Hamilton."—*Douglas's Peerage*, by Wood, i. 121.

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 159; *Registrum Honoris de Morton*.

And now the courage, fierceness, and tenacity of purpose that had made the man terrible, rendered his death a necessity. He was like a ferocious wild beast in the toils—if he escaped with life, he would leap upon the hunters and rend them. His friend Bowes, who was working hard for him, wrote to Cecil: "The most advise to give him undelayed trial in Edinburgh, and like despatch to cut him off, in regard that they think him so deeply offended by these dealings against him, and his nature so implacable, as he may not be suffered to escape their hands."¹ But yet there was no haste. He was imprisoned early in January, and brought to trial before the High Court of Justiciary on the 1st of June. The proceedings were superfluously formal; for it was decided that they should be inscribed on the records not only of the Court, but also on those of the Estates of Parliament, with the great seal and the seals of the Estates appended, "for the fortification, approbation, and confirmation thereof." A jury of sixteen was impannelled, eleven of them Lords of Parliament, the others barons. Thus he had trial of his peers, probably not to his advantage.

The indictment named as his accomplices "James, sometime Earl of Bothwell," and the others present at the Kirk-of-Field. The narrative of the method of the deed has a certain old quaintness that may relieve it of the stiffness of the modern style-book. The group of murderers did, "at twa hours after midnight or thereby, come to the lodging beside the Kirk-of-Field, within the said burgh of Edinburgh, where our said sovereign lord's dearest father was lodged for the time; and there, by way of hamesucken, brigancy, and forethought felony, maist wildly, unmercifully, and treasonably slew and murdered him, with William Tailleur and Andrew M'Aige, his cubiculars, when as they, buried in sleep, were taken the night's rest, brint his haill lodging foresaid, and raised the same in the air by force of gunpowder." The evidence produced is not on record. One morsel of it was expected to be very exciting—it was to be the "band" for the

¹ Correspondence, 163.

murder produced by Balfour in a green box; but the "band" was not to be seen then or ever afterwards. The sentence, along with the forfeiture of all his estates, doomed him "to be had to ane gibbet beside the market-cross of the said burgh of Edinburgh, and there hanged till he were dead; and thereafter drawn, quartered, and demeaned as ane traitor."¹

But the sentence was not effected in this form. He was beheaded on the 2d of June 1581. That the instrument used was that called in Scotland "the Maiden," but now better known as the guillotine, we know by those who were present describing how he put his neck under the axe.²

It is observable, that although he was ranked with Murray as a champion of the more zealous portion of the new Church, the Presbyterians stood idly by as the tragedy was acted. He was among them, but not of them. He had rather impeded than helped those movements towards the pure Presbyterian polity which Murray had not lived to witness. He had not Murray's correctness of life; and though we find him in his correspondence invoking the Deity and using conventional phrases of a pious kind, they did not pass as the genuine coin of seriousness. Yet he met his death with a dignity rather of the Christian than the pagan type. On the day of his execution he was visited by a deputation of clergymen, who harassed him with thirteen questions on points of conscience and conduct. These he answered at length, gravely, courteously, and in the spirit of penitence and forgiveness—such at least is the character of the narrative of the scene preserved by his inquisitors. This "confession," as it is generally termed, has already been cited on the point where he admitted that he had been consulted about the murder, and knew it was to be done.³ On another charge

¹ Pitcairn, i. 114-116.

² There is a tradition that he invented "the Maiden" or ancient guillotine, which may now be seen in the museum of the Antiquarian Society in Edinburgh, and that he was beheaded by it; but this engine—the weighted axe descending in grooves—was common long before his time.

³ Chap. xlv.

on which he was questioned—the poisoning of the Chancellor Athole—he made this rather remarkable answer: “Fye! there is over-mickle filthiness in Scotland already; God forbid that that vile practice of poisoning should enter among us. I would not for the earldom of Athole have either ministrate poison unto him, or caused it to be ministrate unto him; yea, if I had been a hundred, and he his alone, I would not have stirred a hair of his head.”¹

On the general question of his spiritual condition he said: “And indeed now I acknowledge the great mercy of God in this, that among all the benefits He had bestowed upon me, this is one of the chiefest, that in this my last trouble He has given space and leisure to repent me my sins, and to be at a point with my God; in whilk trouble also I have found greater comfort than ever I could have found before, because thereinto I had concluded within myself, that if God should have spared my life, and delivered me out of this trouble, that then I should have cast away all the cares of the world, pleasure of the same, and delight of all earthly things, and dedicate myself hereafter to serve my God in all kind of quietness and simplicity; and if it should please God to take me in this trouble, I had concluded to be content therewith also, being always assured of the mercies of God; and therefore now I thank God that now I find me at this point, that I am rather content to die than live, and that I shall not see the miseries to come; for I will assure you that I think to be the most acceptable time that ever God could have taken me, for I perceive and foresee such miseries and confusions to ensue, that I thank God I shall not see them; and ye who fear God and live behind me, when as ye shall see these things, ye shall wish of God to be where I shall be—that is, with Him.”²

They held at him in this fashion to the very end on the scaffold. “A comfortable prayer was made by Mr James Lawson.” During its performance the victim lay, as we are told, in grief, “his body making great rebound-

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 320.

² Ibid., 324.

ings of sighs and sobs." This phenomenon was not attributed to any nervous impatience of his persecutors, but was counted a sign "of the inner and mighty working of the Spirit of God, as they who were present and knew what it was to be earnestly moved in prayer might easily perceive." His new friends gathered round him to take a reconciling farewell; and they tell how, "after he had taken us all by the hands that were about him, and bidden us farewell in the Lord, he passeth both constantly, patiently, and humbly, without fear of death, to the place of execution, and laid his craig under the axe, his hands being unbound; and thereafter, Mr Walter putting him always in mind, and crying in his ear these words following, he cried continually till his head was stricken off, 'Lord Jesus, receive my soul. In Thy hands, Lord, I commit my spirit. Lord Jesus, receive my soul;' whilk words he was speaking even when the axe fell on his neck."¹

The news of the steps towards this tragedy were received at the Court of Elizabeth with utterances of rage which took in some measure the tone of fear. It was resolved to stop it if possible. Stronger steps were taken than those merely against the favourite; and a greater man than Bowes was sent to Scotland—Randolph himself. Under the Earl of Huntingdon two thousand footmen and five hundred horse were assembled on the Borders, with two months' provisions; and Bowes, then treasurer of Berwick, was directed to advance £2000 for the service of the force.² The threat implied in these preparations seems only to have excited wrath, and thus to have frustrated any influence which Randolph's persuasions might have exercised. He found himself utterly baffled. His information showed that an invasion of Scotland would be a serious matter, and the preparations proved but an empty threat. In fact, like Sadler nearly forty years earlier, he feared violence, and was glad to return safely home. He had to say to his instructor, Walsingham: "I have been here so evil dealt with, that beside the libe-

¹ Bannatyne's Memorials, 332.

² Bowes's Correspondence, 165.

set upon my lodgings-door on Wednesday last, I had a shot bestowed upon the window of my chamber in the place where I am wont to sit and write. My good hap was to be away when it was shot, otherwise Miles and I had been past writing ; for the piece being charged with two bullets, struck the wall opposite, before me and behind him, where I am accustomed to sit, the table behind us. Some show of search is made for fashion's sake."¹

It had now been the practice for a long period for the Court of England to keep a spy in Scotland, whether in the shape of an ambassador or of some humbler emissary. Of old his duty was to notice how far conquest was practicable. In later times, when the connection of the royal families made a union of the crowns on one head not an unlikely event, the temper of these embassies was changed. We will not rightly estimate them without keeping in view that the English claim of feudal superiority was never forgotten ; but its recollection was subsidiary to a tone of friendship and even affection, as in the intercourse of relations with each other. Elizabeth especially seemed to take a motherly interest in the young prince ; and without committing herself she could dazzle him with brilliant hopes. So Walsingham instructs Bowes to reason with the royal boy against the elevation of the favourite, adding to the instruction : " In case he shall reply, as it is likely he will, that Lennox is his nearest kinsman, and therefore cannot but repose trust in him, her majesty would have you let him understand, that if kindred be a thing he so greatly weigheth, then, if he look rightly into the matter, he shall see that there is no kindred that he ought to prefer before hers, who by effects hath always showed such fair and true fruit of love towards him, as that nature could not work greater in those that were tied in the nearest degree of kindred unto him. Besides, her quality and means to do him either good or harm, if they be well weighed, may give him just cause to prefer the kindred of a Queen of England before an Earl of Lennox."²

¹ Proofs and Illustrations, P. F. Tytler, No. vi.

² Bowes's Correspondence, 114.

The letters sent home by the English emissaries in Scotland are ever filled with rumours or conjectures generally of an exciting kind. We have seen specimens of what they had to say when the events in Scotland were more marvellous than those we are now dealing with, and infinitely more important from their connection with the policy of France and England. What the revelations furnished to the present day by the letters of these men are worth, both in times when there is much to reveal and when there is little, may be estimated by their nature during the events accompanying the present crisis. These letters are stuffed with rumours about external agencies. The favourite is to adjust a double government, in which Queen Mary is to be a partner with her son ; and there is an active agency with the Guises to promote the scheme. Another time the king is to be kidnapped and sent to France or Spain. Then the banished Hamiltons are coming over from Spain with an army of twenty thousand men fully equipped. At other junctures, although the rumours were multitudinous and widely astray, one can see that some of them had roots somewhere ; but at this time it is clear that they are idle fictions of the brain.¹ If

¹ Yet there is something interesting in the following particular rumour, were it only in its carrying us over some of the old familiar ground of Rizzio's murder : "The servant showed him that it would be done that night, being Monday last, or else on Wednesday at night next following ; and that his master, Alexander Stewart, with others, were in readiness, and would first enter themselves into the church while the king should be at supper ; and next come up the dark stair into the long gallery over the church, where they would remain until they should be advertised that the lords were departed from the king to their own suppers ; and then they would enter into the little gallery under the king's lodging, saying they had the keys of the door already delivered to them by John Bagge, the king's porter ; and coming to the king they would put his person in safety. Herewith he said that the Earl of Glencarne should have these in his company, Stewart, captain of the Bass ; and these two should come to the king, and persuade him to be contented and to send for the duke. Lastly, he told him that they would there kill the Earl of Marr, the Abbot of Dunfermline, the Prior of Blantyre, the Parson of Camsay, and Mr John Colville. The sompter-man being brought before Colonel Stewart, and examined by him, did still stand to his tale, affirming it to be true ; whereupon the colonel informed the

the emissaries were so foolish as to believe them, there can be no doubt that the wise men in Queen Elizabeth's confidence knew better ; and the mystery about the whole is to find out what object of statecraft was served by the collecting and retailing so much fallacious information.¹

On one point, however, during the favourite's rise, we can see that the English emissary had a glimpse, though but a faint one, of something practical. The Scots nobles would listen to none of his projects against the favourite, but he felt that they were plotting something among themselves. There was even a distinct story of an attempt to

king, and by his commandment search was made for the said servant, that was then presently attending his master in the town ; yet he was so withdrawn as he could not be found, neither is there anything done to his master, but is left at large and at his own liberty. This enterprise should have been executed on Tuesday last, and that night the duke came in great haste to Blackness. Fernihurst, accompanied with iij score horsemen armed, was on Leith sands before iij of the clock in the morning ; and it is found that sundry other troops of horsemen were about the king that night. The Earl of Morton had been with the duke very secretly in the evening, and that night he continued in readiness and armed ; howbeit I had so provided that such watch was laid about him, Newbottle, Glenclowden, and such others of that faction, as they should not have strayed far from their lodgings."—Bowes's Correspondence, 268.

¹ Yet when an opportunity for getting at real facts occurred, they had little scruple how they seized it—as, for instance :—

"On Tuesday last here arrived two ships at Leith from Deepe ; therewith was brought two packets of letters to the Duke of Lennox ; and (as I am informed) the one of them is sent from La Mothe, the French ambassador for England. I had intelligence given me immediately upon the landing of the carrier of the pacquets, whereupon I sought to intercept them ; but, by the mean of Andrew Lamb of Leith, they were presently sent to the duke, then at Callander. And albeit I sought to have had some pursuit after the carrier, departed that night to Lithgow, yet I could not obtain any help or order for the recovery of these letters.

"It is given out by such as came in these ships, that the said ambassador was departed from Bologna to come into England, before they came from Depe ; who is here daily looked for. And it is said he bringeth great store of French crowns, which opinion worketh mighty effects both in this Court and also in this whole realm, to the great advantage of the duke and his friends. Dunfermling moved me yesterday to write speedily for his stay, wherein I let him know that I have prevented his request."—Bowes's Correspondence, 270.

keep the young prince in the Castle of Doune. This fortress, very strong in that age, overhangs the Teith between Stirling and Callander, where its picturesque ruins are well known to the tourist. It was the mansion of the lordship of Doune, then belonging to James Stewart, the son-in-law of the Regent Murray. The faint glimpse we obtain of this affair is merely a note by Bowes of a conversation with the king, in which "he showed that he himself, as it is true indeed, defeated the device at the Doon by finding fault with the want of beds and other requisites, and by his hasty return to Stirling; for he considered, he said, that the matter was like to come to blood." He seems, however, though he thus dexterously evaded conclusions, to have spoken in a boastful manner of this affair: "And albeit some had essayed to persuade him that force would be used for the retention of his care and person, yet he said he knew sufficiently that none would presume so far on their own strength, seeing he could easily daunt any such person or purpose."¹

Yet, except such faint glimpses as this, with others still more dim and dubious, Bowes, with all his ductile art, could get no clue to the policy of the leaders. How entirely he was baffled will be seen in what he obtained from the man who was to be leader in the great enterprise. There is a conference with Ruthven concerning the position and designs of the favourite, and the means of defeating them: "Whereupon he affirmed, that of his own knowledge he saw no other mind in Lennox than to serve the king truly; and to honour her majesty and maintain the amity truly, adding therewith, that Lennox had little power of himself to do any great matters in Scotland without the assistance of the nobility and other friends joined with him, who once espying any purpose or course in him to practise anything against the religion or amity with her majesty, would both soon leave him alone, and also withstand his practices."²

Among the several strongholds belonging to this Lord Ruthven, one, a few miles northward of Perth, consists

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 70.

² Ibid., 133.

still of two strong heavy square towers, called Castle Ruthven, and sometimes Huntingtower. King James was from his earliest years a mighty hunter, and fond of fine horses. He came, as the guest of Lord Ruthven, to pursue his favourite sport, on the 22d of August 1581. Next morning he was astonished by the throng of guests in and about the castle. There were, in fact, a thousand armed men there. The boy soon found that he was a prisoner; for when he professed to wend his way, the Master of Glamis laid hold of him. According to a well-known legend, the boy wept, and the master made the consolatory remark, "Better bairns greet than bearded men." Arran, coming to the gate to pay his court to the king, was seized and carried to a place of security. The Earl of Angus, as a person from whom danger or opposition might also be expected, was guarded. This affair is well known in history as "the Raid of Ruthven."

The king's external position was not that of a prisoner. He went about as a monarch, attended by a very large train of sedulous and well-armed followers. He went almost immediately to Perth, thence in a few days to Stirling, where he abode until the 8th of October, when he passed on to Holyrood and held a Parliament.

The heroes of this enterprise uttered to the world two manifestoes or vindications of their conduct. The one was a small printed pamphlet, bearing the cumbrous title in the note below, which may be read as a faithful summary of what comes after it.¹

¹ 'Ane Declaratioun of the iust and necessar causis moving us of the Nobillitie of Scotland, and uthers the King's Maiesteis faithful subjectis, to repair to his Hienes presence, and to remane with him for resisting of the present daingeris appearing to Goddis trew religion and professors thair of, and to his Hienes awin person, estait, and croun, and his faithful subjectis that hes constantly continuait in his obedience; and to seik redres and reformatioun of the abuse and confusioun of the commoun wealth, remouing fro his Maiestie the cheif authouris thair of quhil the treuth of the samin may be maid manifest to his Hienes Estaits, that with common consent redres and remeid may be provided. Derectit from Striuling, with speciall command and licence to be prentit, anno M.D.LXXXII.' (Reprinted in fac-simile, with Mr Maidment's notes, from the only known

The description and character here given of Lennox and Arran is: "Men born heritors to na thing in this land, partly moved by ignorance of this estate, and partly by an ambitious desire not only to be equals but superiors to the ancient nobility—clothing them with the pretence of the king's highness' name and kinrent, and ascribing unto his majesty the odious title of an arbitrary power." There is a charge of trafficking in the king's name with Papists, and especially the Papal Courts of Spain and France, which was all so ineffective, that it "in end, notwithstanding the concurrence of the Pope's nuncio and others most notable persecutors of the Kirk of God in France, wrought not so much as to procure him ance to be styled king." And here it may be noted by the way, that what they set down as a slight, was really a furtherance of that Protestant cause to which they professed allegiance. The Papal powers would not diplomatically acknowledge the Government of King James, and thus all means of direct tampering with the king or his advisers was excluded.

The apology refers to ecclesiastical transactions to be presently noticed, and appeals to the Presbyterian party. The massacre of St Bartholomew, though now ten years old, was yet a tower of strength. It was still worth while to proclaim that it was to be repeated in Scotland. Some story had got abroad about a quantity of blank warrants signed by the king, and put into the favourite's hands to be filled up as he pleased. Were these not "the special names of such of the nobility, officers, and of the king's true servants, that were destinate for the massacre in all

copy, which is in the Advocates' Library, and had been in the Harleian Collection.)

The reason of the disappearance of all but one copy is supposed to be the suppression of the pamphlet on the counter-revolution. In an Act of the Parliament of 1584, as to the Raid, there is provision, "that nane of his highness' subjects in time coming presume or tak upon hand, by word or writ, to justify and allow the said most treasonable attempt at Ruthven, or to keep in register or store any books, rhyme, act, band, or writ whatsoever, tending to the allowing and approbation of the same attempt at Ruthven in any sort."—Act. Parl., iii. 295.

men's mouths, and nothing resting but the execution, since the authors of the like in France had obtained place and credit to command also in Scotland"?¹ It is among the charges, that the young king is seduced away from "the sermons of godly preachers." But in the next page there are a few words which perhaps reveal more than all the rest the motives for siding with the new movement of the Church. We shall see how the Assembly professed to excommunicate the Archbishop of Glasgow; and one of the grievances of the land is, that although he was excommunicated, strong measures were taken for forcibly levying the fruits or temporalities of the see, "to answer and obey the said excommunicate man of the rents and fruits of the archbishopric of Glasgow."

The other exculpatory document was an Act of Indemnity passed at a meeting of the Estates, in the king's presence at Holyrood, on the 19th of October. It may be noted, that while the party in the ascendant were appealing to the sympathy of the Presbyterian party, they were so far away from an acknowledgment of Presbyterian forms and government, that in the roll of members attending the sitting we find Patrick, Archbishop of St Andrews; Adam, Bishop of Orkney; and James, Bishop of Dunkeld. The Act passed was properly an indemnity; but in its terms it was a vote of applause, thanks, and confidence. The evils and dangers of the land, and the peril to the liberties of the people, who are losing the protection of their old laws, are briefly described. The excellent young king has all

¹ Mr Froude's unwinding, in his 30th chapter, of the complicated plots which were to realise the projects of the Romanist powers at that juncture, must be read by every one with deep interest. It even adds to this interest to know how totally unfelt they were in Scotland—the place where the whole circle of separate movements was to be concentrated. There was much general fear of the Catholic powers and their intentions, and it was known that they would be helped at home. But it was sheer armed force that the Scots dreaded, not the wily schemes of subtle Jesuit priests. These, whatever mischief they might work through the government apparatus of despotic Courts, had no power to wield the political influences of a country governed like Scotland in the open face of day.

the heart in the world to remedy the evils of his suffering people, and rescue them from danger. He was restrained, however, by the machinations of evil men, until certain gallant and devoted subjects came to his rescue. Such is the general tenor of the Act. The persons whom it honours specially by name are William Earl of Gowrie, John Earl of Mar, and James Earl of Glencairn. These potentates, after the fashion which becomes those who are to receive a spontaneous distinction from an assembled body, declined to vote or take part in the business before the house. There was yet a significant feature in the document. Such an important service could not be effected without some acts which might be construed into breaches of the letter of the law. It is therefore provided, that "the said persons, nor name of them, their friends, kinsmen, servants, tenants, assistants, and partakers of whatsoever quality, pre-eminence, or degree, shall incur na danger or skaith therethrough in their persons, lands, nor goods, and shall not be called nor accused for the same civilly or criminally in any manner of way in time coming."¹

To the English Government it was of the utmost moment to direct towards proper ends the power that had thus so suddenly come to preponderate in Scotland. Bowes was sent there again; but it was felt that a stronger man was needed at so critical a post, and Secretary Davison, whose name afterwards was universally renowned, appeared at Holyrood. The destitution of the new Government in the matter of physical force was critical and alarming. The confederates had nothing to rely on but the feudal service of their vassals, whom they had no

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 326-328. The shape in which this Act appears on the Record edition of the Scots Statutes carries on its face the mark of what Bowes says (p. 180)—"The realm of Scotland is often subject to sudden and many changes;" and another—"The tickle state of this realm, subject to change, and labouring like a working sea in the storm" (350). The Act of Indemnity had, in the counter-revolution which followed it, been not merely repealed but cancelled, by ink scores drawn from corner to corner, and crossing in the middle. So the Act is printed with like cross scores from corner to corner.

means of feeding, even if they could have left their usual pursuits to hang about Holyrood. For any critical enterprise two or three thousand men might at once be gathered; but how to get two hundred armed men as a constant body-guard to the young king, was a problem at which they worked all the time of their brief reign without solving it. The difficulties that impeded it are instructive. Bowes was endowed with a thousand pounds of Government money, with the prospect of more if he found a profitable political investment for what he had. With the money which he had and might have he proposed to support the body-guard so urgently needed. It must have been to his surprise that this was in the mean time declined, on the part both of the confederates themselves, and of the king in whose name everything was done. The words in which Bowes reports this conclusion are as follows: "They showed that the king, declaring by his great misliking of the levy of soldiers, did acknowledge this action to be taken in hand and done for his own profit, promising to accept it for his good service, and to procure the rest of the nobility and convention to be next assembled to ratify the same, and to appoint a Parliament to confirm it; so as they thought it now not needful to levy and entertain the numbers before appointed, and without apparent necessity they would not put her majesty to any expenses; concluding that they would for this time fortify themselves of their own friends and servants to be kept about them during their attendance with the king, and would forbear to charge her majesty until farther necessity or other accident should fall."¹

It would be difficult to see the motive for this self-denial, were it not for the key supplied by the tenor of previous history. The confederates dreaded the effect on the popular mind of co-operating with mercenaries in the pay of England. How they would have decided had aid been offered on a larger scale—had the troops and the money been thousands for hundreds—it would be useless to guess; it is only clear that the penurious assistance

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 198.

offered to them was not worth taking at the price it might cost in popularity.

But the ambassador found, that although the gift he bore was thus collectively and politically rejected, there was a strong individual hankering after that thousand pounds. Some men's estates had suffered severely in this eminent public service to both realms in which they were embarked, and they hinted their hopes that a generous queen would not see them utterly ruined. To some Bowes appears to have been able to make gifts of costly gems—a form of reward more decorous than payment in hard cash. The thousand pounds he protected by maintaining that it was intrusted to him for a purpose from which he dared not divert it. Sometimes he lends a little money; but it is from his own private means, which are limited. In this he acted under direct instruction from his mistress. It was one of the most unpalatable shapes in which she ever put her favourite precept, do this “as from yourself.” Walsingham guaranteed him personally to the extent of £300: “If her majesty should leave the burthen upon you, I will not fail to see you myself discharged of the same.”¹ But the advances made by Bowes were larger. He was like the agent who does a little for his own behoof as well as his employer's, and probably has not made up his mind which of them is to be concerned until results are visible.

As the months passed over the young king and those attendants who partook of the double character of courtiers and jailers, there was one outside whose will had been all in all with him, and who was still formidable in his ruin. It was desirable that Lennox should go back to the country whence he came; but he held to Scotland with great tenacity. His movements were like those of the discharged domestic who holds that he has been unjustly dealt with, and comes now with the whine of poverty, now with something like a threat of vengeance. At one time in the cold Scots winter he finds a retreat in the barren Cumbraes, then he has to move farther from dan-

¹ Letters of John Colville, 28.

ger into the remote Highland fastnesses of Cowal. On another occasion he appears in the Lowlands with a following larger than the king's. He is in the strong Castle of Dumbarton ; he had been made commander there, and can still hold the place. Then he moves eastward to another royal fortress of which he was made governor—Blackness, only some fifteen miles from the Court. Bowes told his Government that from this quarter a counter-blow was imminent. Writing on the 6th of December, he takes credit for having through his own sagacity repelled such a disaster. Founding on information obtained by him, he had “earnestly moved the king, his Council, and others, to gather more forces, and keep a strong watch about the king for prevention of danger ; which with great difficulty was at length performed, and yet not with sufficient provision ; for it was persuaded to the king that this suspicion, founded on vain bruits, ought not to put him in fear or trouble his Court.” The ambassador adorned this despatch with a distinct and almost picturesque account of the manner in which the blow was to be struck ; but, with the thousand other rumours of events in Scotland not destined to occur, it only supplies an item to the crowd of chimeras, with their phantom actors, through which the searcher after realities in these diplomatic mazes must wander.¹

To this the next item of news fits on as its other side : “The duke doth lay out his distressed estate in large manner, praying the king to have compassion thereof, and also confesseth that sundry noblemen and others offered to him to attempt the enterprise for recovery of the king's person ; and in hope of the execution of the same, he hastened unto Blackness, thinking that since the device proceeded not from himself, and that it was not to touch or hurt the king's person, that he might therefore look on and see what should succeed.” But there is more humiliation in store. He lingers because “he had neither money for his expenses nor furniture meet for his journey ; and he trusted the king would not put him away with such

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 267.

shame, and in that bare state ; whereupon he prayed some time to make provision to supply these wants.”¹ So sordid an antithesis to the favourite in his climax of power, following as it does close on the tragic history of Morton, gives to the Scotland of that day an unpleasing resemblance to the Court of an Oriental despotism, where the omnipotent favourite of one day is on the next the abject wretch whose revolted slaves may spit upon him. The poor man asked leave to raise money by “wadset” or mortgage of his estates ; but this was refused : it would reduce the value of the “escheat” or forfeiture that was to sweep back to the Crown the vast domain he had acquired. It is only when Bowes presses for severity, that, in the true antagonistic spirit of their country, the favourite’s triumphant enemies are for moderation. Demanding his instant removal from Scotland, he complains how “they answered that their law and common order alloweth that the party enjoined to pass to any place prescribed, ought to have reasonable time for the performance of that charge.”² It is not until the 22d of December that Bowes has the satisfaction to write to London, “that this great work for the duke’s departure is with no little difficulty finished at the length.”³ Thus hustled out of the country in the dead of winter, he died in Paris before the return of summer. It was said afterwards in Scotland, probably in some compunctious impulse, that he adhered stoutly to the Protestantism which he had adopted in Scotland ; that he would not permit the priest to give him the viaticum ; and that “neither the King of France, nor yet the nobility there—nay, not his own lady—gave him any respect, in that he had joined himself to the Protestant religion in Scotland, and had communicate with them.”⁴

Bowes, according to his own account of his mission, had several long confidential conferences with the king. One would not suppose, in reading his story of these, that he had been transacting the deep State mysteries he tells of with a youth of sixteen, whose capacity for real business,

¹ Bowes’s Correspondence, 272.

² Ibid., 285.

³ Ibid., 296.

⁴ Balfour’s Annals, i. 374.

even at the maturest of his years, was not held in much esteem. But there is a general concurrence of testimony as to his precocious wisdom ; and it would seem, indeed, that what maturity he was to have, came to him at the age when those destined to great capacities are yet children.

The peculiarities and defects which give so grotesque a tone to the acts and character of King James, appear indeed to have grown with his years, and to have been hidden during his boyhood behind a pedantic demureness. It has been in the experience of most men to witness such a phenomenon. The natural propensities have been subdued by training ; but after the escape from drill, they grow by degrees, casting off the artificial restraints, and the man, as he advances in years, seems to lapse into boyhood. One faculty of which he was ever proud he seems to have even then mastered—the capacity for falsehood, which he called “kingcraft.” For instance, during the pressure for the departure of the favourite, and after he has expressed his entire devotion to Queen Elizabeth, and his gratitude for the assistance of those sage advisers sent to him by her in his difficulties, there comes what is thus told :—

“The king hath showed such manifest signs, witnessing a great change and alteration in his conceit and favour towards the duke, as the lords are highly comforted therewith ; for with unaccustomed oath he hath protested to and assured the noblemen, with his colour changed, his hands lifted up, that if the duke should disobey this charge, then he shall never from henceforth have to do with the duke, nor show favour to him nor to any of his favourers, but to esteem him and them as his enemies ; and that he shall do to the duke the thing he never thought to have done.”¹ Surely it is charitable to suppose that the boy told a fib to his formidable courtiers, rather than believe that in heart he could turn thus against the man on whom he had impetuously heaped every available token of attachment. Both Bowes himself, and the lords who were

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 285, 286.

“highly comforted,” had afterwards grave doubts about his sincerity in the matter, and found that their own coercive pressure was of more avail than the reaction in his royal bosom.

On another, and a rather important occasion, he showed a capacity at this period for his own kind of kingcraft. La Mothe Fénelon, the ambassador from France to England, came to him. As we have seen, diplomatic relations of Scotland with Paris were suspended, because there James was not acknowledged as king. Fénelon had obtained his mother's permission to address him as king.¹ There was something in this reminding one of the old subtlety about the religion established by law in Scotland, and the evasion of the treaty which acknowledged Elizabeth's right to the English throne. To be entitled to address him as King by special licence for the occasion from his mother, was about as strong a protest of her own title to be still the Queen as the most ingenious diplomacy could have devised.

It is at this point that we come across the most distinct of the generally faint traces about the “Association” or project suggested in France of uniting his mother's name in the government, and making it a joint sovereignty. Whatever might be expected ultimately to come from such a project, one, if not the chief reason given for pressing it at this moment, seems to have been that King James, by nominally acceding to the arrangement, would open the door to diplomatic communication with the Government of France.² Bowes had the eminent satisfaction to report that the king was dead against this plan; “that he was for his own part ready to shut his ears against that or any like motion whatsoever which should tend to the impairing of his authority, peril of his estate, and his own dishonour—all which he confessed to be at hazard, if, from a sole king as he had hitherto continued from his cradle, he should now fall to divide and communicate his authority to others.” As to Queen Eliza-

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 353.

² See Queen Mary's letter to Beaton; Labanoff, v. 253.

beth, on the other hand, he was deeply grateful for her renewed offers of countenance, "acknowledging her manifold deservings at his hands to be worthy of an extraordinary love and thankfulness towards her above all the princes of the earth, who, he had protested, had even such especial interest in him, as she might no less account and dispose of him than of herself, as his actions and deeds should give good testimony."¹ If, as some have believed, he was then engaged in deep plots for the reinstatement of his mother and the restoration of the French influence over Scotland, he had, indeed, made promising progress in his favourite statecraft. But it will be afterwards seen that it was his nature to employ this gift entirely for the promotion of his own particular interests.

Bowes afterwards found reason for being dissatisfied with this assurance, and to be suspicious about the "association." He had got trace of some particulars which the king knew, and he desired to get the whole from him. Documents about the association had passed. In particular, Lennox had the plan in writing, and had handed that writing to the king—where was it? There is a long misty discussion, which only reveals that an experienced and acute man is trying, and trying in vain, to extract plain dealing from a tricky and sometimes sulky youth, who has the privilege when hard pressed of retiring behind the barrier of his rank. He thought the document might be in the hands of his advocate; wherever it might be, he could not, or would not, get it, nor would he explain the specific character of its contents. All that could be extracted from him was, that he did not like the document; but at that time Bowes could get from him no absolute repudiation of the project of association.² It was only after much anxious and tiresome dealing that he was able to say: "The plainness and earnest declaration of the king against the association coming to the knowledge of his mother (as I think it shall soon do), shall peradventure readily offend her: yet that matter is

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 352.

² Ibid, 470, 471.

so much condemned here by the king and all others, as it could be otherwise qualified nor suppressed.”¹

Connected but not identical with the project of the association, there was much reference to what was termed “the treaty” between the two queens for the liberation of “the mother of the king.” This is but casually spoken of, and treated as a profound secret; other than that, the negotiations tell us no more about it, and it is more fleeting and indistinct than the association.

Fénélon was joined in his mission by M. Meynville, a gentleman especially attached to the house of Guise. Poor Bowes had thus much need of the assistance he had obtained. When Davison was sent to him, it was to deal with Fénélon, “because Mr Bowes, her majesty’s ambassador here, was not furnished languages to treat with him upon such occasion as might happen during his abode in these parts.”² Destitute of the aid he so received, Bowes might have attended at sittings where treason was adjusted in his presence, for the king was a good linguist.

Such a powerful apparatus of diplomacy as thus clustered in the remote Court of Holyrood would seldom be witnessed save in some solemn international conference. It was all wasted; for there were no distant forces which the pulling of diplomatic wires could move. Neither France nor England was prepared to enforce a policy by invasion. Scotland had no particular attachment to either, and would accept such a government as the balance of strength in its own domestic parties might bring uppermost. Thus the armed force of the rough barons surrounding the king was for the time stronger than the subtlest diplomatic adroitness.

We must not leave the diplomatists, to turn to the next scene of the shifting drama, without mention of a negotiation pursued by Bowes about a matter so small, that if we read the discussion about it without some foreknowledge, we would wonder how those commissioned with great political movements could deal with an affair so trifling. It was nothing but the possession of a little

¹ Bowes’s Correspondence, 492.

² *Ibid.*, 320.

ornamented box containing private letters and scraps of poetry—the celebrated “casket” and its contents. Bowes found that the casket “had been delivered to sundry hands, and thereby was presently wanting and unknown where it rested.” Now, he had traced it, with its contents, into Gowrie’s possession. Murray had taken them back from England. On his death they passed into the hands of Lennox, and then passed over to Morton’s.¹ How, on his ruin, they had fallen into Gowrie’s hands, is not known. Bowes made a demand that they should be given over to Queen Elizabeth, “adding thereto such words and arguments as might first stir up hope of liberality, and also best effect the purpose.”² The portion of the argument that had no concern with liberality deserves attention. It consisted in “letting him know the purpose of the Scottish queen, both giving out that these letters are counterfeited by her rebels, and also seeking therein to have them delivered to her or defaced; and that the means which she will make in this behalf shall be so great and effectual as these writings cannot be safely kept in that realm without dangerous offence to him that hath the custody thereof; neither shall he that is once known to have them be suffered to hold them in his hands.”³

Ruthven would not admit that he possessed this perilous treasure; but seeing that Bowes’s information was sure, he said he would look for them when he returned to his own house. He was then at Holyrood. He did not, however, promise to deliver them up; and the ambassador wasted much ingenuity and patient labour in vain efforts to extract them. Ruthven gave as a reason for retaining them, that the confederates, who had removed the queen from the throne, required them to be kept “as an evidence to warrant and make good that action.” A commentary made by Bowes on this is worthy of note. He said: “Their action in that part touching the assignation of the crown to the king by his mother had received such establishment, confirmation, and strength, by Acts of Parlia-

¹ Goodall, ii. 91, 235.

² Bowes’s Correspondence, 240.

³ Ibid., 254.

ment and other public authority and instruments, as neither should that case be suffered to come to debate and question, nor such scrolls and papers ought to be showed for the strengthening thereof, so as these might well be left, and be rendered to the hands of her majesty, to whom they were destined before they fell in his keeping ; yet he would not be removed nor satisfied."

What Elizabeth wanted with them is open to all guesses. But this passage shows, that whatever vague fears there might be of danger from without, aided by secret intrigues from within, the English ambassador could fairly speak of the king's government as deeply rooted in the adherence of the community of Scotland.

The diplomatic air was still thick with rumours from abroad. That there were formidable powers of destruction even then in preparation against Britain was afterwards proved by the Spanish Armada. Had that expedition been successful, the history of Scotland would probably have run in a different course from that we have to follow. But from events as they really were, nothing touched Scotland, or even distinctly threatened the country. It was said that "the king's mother," as if in the fulness of her old power, had made the Duke of Guise her lieutenant in Scotland ; but nothing practical came of that appointment. The English ambassador, that he might anchor his general rumours and alarms on some solid reality, was obliged sometimes to rely on very small morsels possessed of that quality. Thus it is solemnly reported to the English Court how "Meynville hath sent to the king a present of French apples, almond, and other fruit, which were brought to the king yesterday night ; and sundry think this is a watchword or sign that all things are ripe and ready for the plot laid by Meynville at his being here."¹

Another correspondent announced to Randolph that "the Duke of Guise's master stabler" had brought over "six fair horses " for the king. Two ministers, James Lawson and John Durie, had gone to him to remonstrate against the acceptance of the gift. That the king had a

¹ Bowes's Correspondence, 522.

passion for fine horses gave the affair an insidious aspect, and at the same time rendered the duty of rejection all the more difficult. The young king promised obedience, since he was told that his admonishers spoke the will of God. But there was a suspicion that they had no better success than the unfortunate Trojan prophet in the renowned precedent concerning equine gifts. An ominous coincidence was solemnly reported to Randolph. The king had paid a visit to Dalkeith, and the horses were stabled there.¹

So in Scotland the perplexed ambassador had a sense that something was to happen; but he knew not what it was to be, nor whence it was to come. In fact his conventional diplomatic skill was baffled by the spurious and incidental character of the political movements in Scotland. Nothing is so troublesome occasionally to the skilled detective officer as a great crime committed in an unusual manner by a fresh hand. It is a fact standing alone, without the usual train of cause and effect by which he works. Thus it was with Bowes. So on the 29th of June he found the king in the Castle of St Andrews, the works well manned, and something like an army gathered round him, while "all men stood upon their guard, looking what shall ensue thereon."²

There was a general congress of territorial leaders there to hold a council with the king. Huntly and Marischal brought followers from the north, Argyle brought his contribution from the west. They were altogether too strong for the Ruthven party, who, after a supremacy of ten months' duration, were swept away by a counter-revolution. In the words which Bowes applied to the Raid, subjects had a second time "altered the possession of the king."³ It was a sudden inexplicable reverse, as unexpected by England as the Raid itself had been.

¹ Letters of John Colville, 6. ² Bowes's Correspondence, 466

³ Ibid., 178.

CHAPTER LVIII.

JAMES VI. TO THE LEAGUE WITH ENGLAND.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION—RETROSPECT ON THE RISE OF THIS INFLUENCE—THE GREAT REVIVAL—THE CLAIMS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL ESTATE—THE SECOND BOOK OF DISCIPLINE—THE FIRST COVENANT OR KING'S CONFESSION—GERMS OF PRESBYTERIAN INFLUENCE—THE YOUNG KING AND THE CONTENDING INFLUENCES—THE POLITICAL DOCTRINES OF BUCHANAN—HIS DEATH—DISPOSAL OF THE RUTHVEN PARTY—THE BANISHED LORDS AT NEWCASTLE WITH THE BANISHED CHURCH—HOW THEY ENDURED DISCIPLINE—STRUGGLE BETWEEN ARRAN AND RUTHVEN—RUTHVEN'S FALL AND EXECUTION—THE PERNICIOUS SUPREMACY OF ARRAN—A BORDER SQUABBLE—WORKS TO ARRAN'S RUIN—THE MASTER OF GRAY—THE LEAGUE WITH ENGLAND.

It may now be right to turn to a great religious revival which was connected with these political events, but so slightly and inactively as to have a separate history of its own. These revivals, however dear they may be in the memory of partisans, are generally viewed with coldness, if not aversion, by those who do not belong to the particular religious community which has revived. On the present occasion, speaking of the mere social and moral influences set at work, a stranger might welcome the advent of efforts which, whether spiritually orthodox or not, yet had something in them tending to check or modify the spirit of ferocity, rapacity, and sensuality that was spreading moral desolation over the land.

We have seen how the ecclesiastical assemblies were advancing in hostile attitude towards the remnant of the Episcopal hierarchy reserved by the Reformation Acts. In July 1580, the Assembly found that "the office of ane

bishop, as it is now used and commonly taken within this realm, has no sure warrant, authority, or good ground out of the Scripture of God, but is brought in by folly and corruption, to the great overthrow of the Kirk of God." Therefore the office is abolished; and all professing to hold it are "to demit, quit, and leave the same, as an office whereunto they are not called by God." They are to "desist and cease from all preaching, ministration of the sacraments, or using any way the office of pastors," unless on application they shall again be admitted by the Assembly itself to the ministerial function. Those who disobey this injunction are to be excommunicated.¹

Having thus cleared the way, the Assembly worked on to the completion of their 'Second Book of Discipline,' which was also to be the completion of the polity of the Church on the Presbyterian system. Morton the regent had, as we have seen, a leaning—whether political or conscientious—towards Calvinism, and he desired that there should be a conference of lay statesmen and clergy for the adjustment of the polity; but the clergy would not endure that the ark should be touched by unsanctified hands. They had no objection to laymen acting a proper subordinate part in their Church courts, but they were to have no separate lay interference with the proper prerogatives and duties of these courts. The book, as finally adjusted, was adopted by the Assembly in the spring of 1581.

It is a document thoroughly French in its conception and tenor. The English spirit is to adapt legislation to events and conditions as they arise, not to anticipate and regulate all that is to be. The propensity to indulge in a rigid logic, capable of adjusting itself to all things that may be, has rendered the French prolific in codes and systems which bring all the future under the dominion of the reasoning power of the present. The Second Book is, in fact, a revision of the Huguenot discipline adopted at the first national synod of the Reformed Church of France, held at Paris in 1559. It is much shorter than

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 194.

the French document, yet far more complete; and any one comparing the two will find that they bear to each other the relation of a rough draft, which has been completed and polished by able hands. The First Book of Discipline is full of controversy and denunciation. Knox presided at its construction, and wherever his hand was it would be against some other. The Second Book was the work chiefly of Andrew Melville, a man also of strong will and vehement temper, but endowed with a finer sense of decorum and logical aptness.

To those who have a partiality for the triumphs of logical definition and arrangement, the Second Book might be an acceptable study. If we grant that those who prepared it were what they called themselves—the Church of God, presided over by the Lord Jesus Christ as the representative of the Godhead on earth—it would be difficult to refuse assent to what follows. Nothing can be more perfect than the analysis by which the two ruling powers are separated from each other, and the ecclesiastical set above the secular. It sets forth, that “as the ministers and others of the ecclesiastical Estate are subject to the magistrate civil, so ought the person of the magistrate be subject to the Kirk spiritually and in ecclesiastical government.” Further: “The civil power should command the spiritual to exercise and do their office according to the Word of God; the spiritual rulers should require the Christian magistrate to minister justice and punish vice, and to maintain the liberty and quietness of the Kirk within their bounds.” Nothing could be on its face a fairer distribution. The civil power was entitled to command the spiritual to do its duty; but then the magistrate was not to have authority to “execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done.” This is entirely in the hands of the Church; but in enforcing it the State is the Church’s servant, for it is the magistrate’s duty “to assist and maintain the discipline of the Kirk, and punish them civilly that will not obey the discipline of the same.” Thus the State could give no effective orders to the Church, but the Church could order the State to give material effect to its

rules and punishments. It was the State's duty, at the same time, to preserve for the Church its whole patrimony; and we have seen that this meant all the vast wealth which had been gathered up by the old Church. Among the prerogatives of the clergy it was further declared, that "they have power also to abrogate and abolish all statutes and ordinances concerning ecclesiastical matters that are found noisome and unprofitable, and agree not with the time, or are abused by the people." It might be taken for a secularly popular element in this polity, "that no person be intruded to any of the offices of the Kirk contrary to the will of the congregation to whom they are appointed." But it lay with the ecclesiastical authorities to decide who were members of the Church and who not; it was a free election, but the constituency were chosen by the body among whom they must make their selection.

Much to the tribulation and wrath of the authors of this ecclesiastical constitution, the Estates of Parliament declined to adopt and sanction their handiwork. That they should think it necessary to request confirmation by the State, might seem to imply a practical doubt of the full self-capacity for legislation in ecclesiastical matters so loudly proclaimed by them. They would, however, have overcome any such logical difficulty by explaining that what the Church required of the State was not assistance or support, but a declaration of dutiful obedience to that which the Church had within its proper sphere thought fit to dictate. So the General Assembly, after "divers suits made to the magistrate for approbation thereof, whilk albeit as yet has not taken the happy effect whilk good men would crave," resolved to preserve the document on their own records, and to send a copy of it to each of the presbyteries into which they had just divided the Church.¹ Such was the Church which had constructed itself out of its own materials, without receiving the aid or the sanction of the State. We have now reached that stage of development in which it stands forth as the mature ancestor,

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 219.

of which every Presbyterian communion in Scotland professes to be the representative, and the only legitimate representative, all others who profess that title being impostors. This is a result connected with strong national peculiarities. In England we hear of persons with tender consciences who are constrained to dissent from the Established Church. In Scotland, "dissent" may be imputed like "heresy" or "schism," but it is never spontaneously adopted as a character. Those who separate from their neighbours, cast them forth as under general excommunication from the body of the visible Church. Hence every separate community, in its phraseology and conduct, has professed itself to be the true Church of God, with Jesus Christ at its head; and has treated its old neighbours, with all the rest of the world, as schismatics and offenders against the discipline of the Kirk.¹ There are at present in Scotland ecclesiastical bodies thoroughly constructed according to the Presbyterian model, who count their adherents by hundreds, who are abiding within the ancient sheepfold, waiting patiently until the millions wandering in the desert shall repent and return to them.

During the course of the rapid revolutions in the civil government, there went on a side war of ecclesiastical protestations and denunciations between the supporters of Episcopacy and the Presbyterian community thus formed. By degrees it became a war in which this body had to fight the Court, as well as its natural ecclesiastical enemy. Mr Walter Balcanquhall was accused of an attack on the king's favourite. It was decorated with the peculiar jocularities which the early clergy seem to have inherited from Knox. He said "that within these four years Popery had entered in the country, not only in

¹ It is curious to find, in a man of so much learning as Dr M'Crie, how this spirit comes up, because he was a leader of one of the four only true Churches into which the Secession had been thrown by a double splitting. When he tells of the quarrel at this period, and how excommunications were hurled by both parties, Montgomery, who in virtue of the statute law was Archbishop of Glasgow, and who sat as a lord in Parliament, when spoken of as under the sentence of the Presbyterian Assembly, is called by M'Crie "the Culprit."—Life of Melville 83.

the Court, but in the King's hall, and was maintained by the tyranny of a great champion which is called Grace; and if his grace would oppose himself to God's Word, he should have little grace."¹ The preacher's defence was ready and complete. If he had broken any law, he was ready to submit to the consequences. But this thing had been "spoken publicly in the pulpit," where he was supreme; and "although all the kings of the earth would call it erroneous, yet he is ready here by good reason to prove it to be the very truth of God, and if need require, to seal it with his blood."²

We have seen how Lennox dropped the cause of contention, by cordially, and without any questioning or murmuring, changing Churches. As missionaries among the heathen sometimes find, conversions rapidly and easily accomplished are not always valuable. The ministers had grave doubts touching the sincerity of this instance, and they resolved to exact a broader and stronger pledge of the faithfulness of the Court in general. Accordingly they presented to it for acceptance what is sometimes called the Second Confession of Faith, and otherwise the King's Confession, the Negative Confession, and the First Covenant; for it was in reality a league or covenant, extending the practice of binding men to a common object by bonds or bands so often mentioned. The First Confession was the declaratory announcement of the belief of its subscribers, and therefore it only dealt with inimical doctrines in a few passing words of censure. On the present occasion it was unnecessary to express the belief that had been expressed before, and the object was to lift up a testimony against the enemy. That this testimony was lifted up with power and terseness, the following passage will perhaps satisfy the reader. Following a brief summary of the essential doctrines of Protestantism comes:—

"And therefore we abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine, but chiefly all kinds of Papistry, in general and particular heads, even as they are now

¹ Calderwood, iii. 583.

² Ibid., 584.

damned and confuted by the Word of God and Kirk of Scotland. But in special we detest and refute the usurped authority of that Roman Antichrist, upon the Scriptures of God, upon the Kirk, the civil magistrate, and consciences of men; all his tyrannous laws made upon indifferent things, against our Christian liberty; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written Word, the perfection of the law, the offices of Christ and His blessed Evangel; his corrupted doctrine concerning original sin, our natural inability and rebellion to God's law, our justification by faith only, our imperfect sanctification, and obedience to the law; the nature, number, and use of the holy sacraments, his five bastard sacraments, with all his rites, ceremonies, and false doctrine, added to the ministration of the true sacraments without the Word of God; his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament, his absolute necessity of baptism; his blasphemous opinion of transubstantiation, or real presence of Christ's body in the elements, and receiving the same by the wicked for bodies of men; his dispensations with oaths, perjuries, and degrees of marriage forbidden in the Word; his cruelty against the innocent divorced; his devilish mass, his blasphemous priesthood, his profane sacrifice for the sins of the dead and quick; his canonisation of men, calling upon angels and saints departed, worshipping of imagery, relicts, and crosses; dedicating of kirks, altars, days, vows to creatures; his purgatory, prayers for the dead, praying or speaking in a strange language; his processions and blasphemous litany, and multitude of advocates or mediators; his manifold orders, auricular confession, his desperate and uncertain repentance, his general and doubtful faith, his satisfactions of men for their sins; his justification by works, *opus operatum*, works of supererogation, merits, pardons, peregrinations, and stations; his holy water, baptising of bells, conjuring of spirits, crossing, signing, anointing, conjuring, hallowing of God's good creatures, with the superstitious opinion joined therewith; his worldly monarchy and wicked hierarchy; his three solemn vows, with all his shavelings of sundry sorts; his erroneous and bloody decrees made at

Trent, with all the subscribers and approvers of that cruel and bloody band conjured against the Kirk of God : and, finally, we detest all his vain allegories, rites, signs, and traditions, brought in the Kirk without or against the Word of God and doctrine of this true Reformed Kirk, to the which we join ourselves willingly, in doctrine, faith, religion, discipline, and use of the holy sacraments, as lively members of the same in Christ our Head ; promising and swearing by the great name of the Lord our God, that we shall continue in the obedience of the doctrine and discipline of this Kirk, and shall defend the same, according to our vocation and power, all the days of our lives, under the pains condemned in the law, and danger both of body and soul in the day of God's fearful judgment."

The practical object for which the announcers of these views band themselves together would hardly be anticipated either by the conditions under which it was adopted or this vehement preamble. It was for the defence and support of the king. "We protest and promise with our hearts," they say, "that we shall defend his person and authority with our gear, bodies, and lives, in defence of Christ, His Evangel, liberty of our country, ministration of justice, and punishment of iniquity against all enemies within this realm or without, as we desire our God to be a strong and merciful defender of us in the day of our death."

The king was the first to sign this Testimony. All his courtiers followed ; and a royal mandate was issued to ministers to demand the signatures of their parishioners, and proceed against recusants "according to our laws and order of the Kirk." No triumph could be more complete than this body had accomplished ; but yet there were fears and misgivings among them. Another triumph of a smaller nature awaited them in a blow at the offensive Arran, who "was ordered to make his repentance before he could get his child baptised, born a quarter of a year before he was married, which he did on the morning after that, the 14th of March, in Holyroodhouse, before the king. He confessed his offence, and offered to underly

the discipline of the Kirk. The like ordinance was made for his lady. She was so grieved, that through her grievous words he conceived some displeasure.”¹

This was accompanied by several acts of curious submission by persons in high secular power to the decrees of the ecclesiastical assemblies; and the whole is pervaded with the tone of people dealing with some irrational outbreak, the promoters of which must be humoured to the top of their bent, until things come into order again, and the troublesome people can be kept in their proper place.

The triumphant Church proceeded to “purge” itself of scandalous members. The bishops were *ex officio* a scandal; but a good deal was attributed to their moral conduct, which gave colour and interest to the pursuit. The Church excommunicated Montgomery, the Archbishop of Glasgow, after a squabble with the royal authority; and took steps against Adamson, Archbishop of St Andrews, which after some delay led to the same desirable conclusion. The Raid of Ruthven was a momentary success to the Presbyterian party, but rather the humbling of enemies than the acquisition of friends. Their minister, John Durie, who had preached with conspicuous bitterness against the favourite and the Court, had to obey a charge to remove himself from Edinburgh. His return was a triumph, material as well as moral. As his friend James Melville tells, “John Durie got leave to go home to his own flock of Edinburgh; at whose returning there was a great concourse of the haill toun, wha met him at the Nether Bow, and going up the street with bare heads and loud voices, sang to the praise of God, and testifying of great joy and consolation, the 124th Psalm—‘Now Israel may say, and that truly,’ &c.—till heaven and earth resounded. This noise, when the duke being in the town heard, and lodged in the Highgate, looked out and saw, he rave his beard for anger.”² It was this scene, according to Melville, that convinced Lennox of the necessity of finding safety in the west. Perhaps this is the earliest

¹ Calderwood, iii. 596.

² Diary, 134.

instance of a popular demonstration in honour of Presbyterianism in Scotland. It was another and less wholesome testimony of popular feeling, that the Edinburgh mob insulted Meynville and Fénelon, the French ambassadors. At the king's request, the magistrates gave them a civic banquet. The Church courts decreed a solemn fast on the day of the banquet as an atonement for so sinful an act. We are told that three famous ministers preached on the occasion, and that "betwixt the three exhortations there was reading and singing of psalms."¹

These struggles of the Presbyterian party were up to this point limited to ecclesiastical history, touching the political history of the country only so far as they gave the State some trouble. But Durie's triumph and other incidents showed that the influence of the ministers over the populace was becoming strong enough for political use. Two powers were arising in the State, each claiming absolute rule and contending for supremacy—the Throne and the Church. King James was to reach maturity with the principles and opinions of an absolute monarch. It can scarcely be said that his great instructor, Buchanan, lived to see this utter ruin of the vital part of his teaching. He died, seventy-six years old, on the 28th of September 1582, while his pupil was in the wholesome keeping of the Ruthven lords. He had just finished the great work of his old age, for the dedication of his *History* is dated on the 4th calend, or 2d day of the same month. This book stands among those remarkable instances where the author's estimate of his own works is inverted by public opinion. His psalms, and all the poetry for which his name is illustrious, he spoke of as fugitive trifles when weighed with that effort, which is of little more use and value than as a bulky exercise in the composition of classical Latin.

The *History* was the most eminent piece of typography that in its day had come from the Scots press, and it may stand comparison with the works of the great Continental printers of the sixteenth century. We have a

¹ Calderwood, iii. 369.

charming glimpse both of the printer's and the author's workshop, as he was drawing to the end both of his labour and his days, correcting the proofs of Queen Mary's reign. Melville accompanied his uncle Andrew and Buchanan's cousin Thomas into "the printer's warkhouse;" "whom," as he says, "we find at the end of the seventeenth book of his chronicle, at a place whilk we thought very hard at the time, whilk might be an occasion of staying the haill wark, anent the burial of Davy." This was the statement that Rizzio was buried in the royal vault, followed, as it was, by the inference that the queen had raised him to privileges which degraded herself. It was not easy to alarm Andrew Melville about freedoms with royalty, but he was afraid that this might cause the suppression of the volume. So, "therefore, staying the printer from proceeding, we came to Mr George again, and found him bedfast by [meaning against] his custom, and asking him how he did, 'Even going the way of welfare,' says he. Mr Thomas his cousin shows him of the hardness of that part of his story, that the king might be offended with it, and it might stay all the wark. 'Tell me, man,' says he, 'if I have told the truth.' 'Yes,' says Mr Thomas, 'sir, I think so.' 'I will bide his feud and all his kin's, then,' quoth he. 'Pray, pray to God for me, and let Him direct all.' So, by the printing of his chronicle was ended, that most learned, wise, and godly man ended this mortal life."

The book was dedicated to King James. It is observable that Buchanan, for all his republican temper, indulged in royal dedications. Already occasion has called up that beautiful epigram to Queen Mary, in which he announces the psalms—ever endowed with a touching interest, in the remembrance that the spirit of hope and benediction breathed in it, hold so sad a contrast with the tragic career to which its heroine, then in her fresh youth and newly received into her kingdom, was doomed. His friends found him at the dedication of the History: "When we came to his chamber, we found him teaching his young man that served him in his chamber to spell *a b, ab; e b, eb, &c.* After salutation, Mr Andrew says, 'I see, sir, ye

are nocht idle.' 'Better this,' quoth he, 'nor stealing sheep or sitting idle, which is as ill.' Thereafter he shew us the epistle dedicatory to the king; the whilk, when Mr Andrew had read, he told him that it was obscure in some places, and wanted certain words to perfect the sentence. Says he, 'I may do na mair for thinking on anither matter.' 'What is that?' says Mr Andrew. 'To die!' quoth he; 'but I leave that and many more things for you to help.'"¹ The dedication was in a great measure an admonition to his emancipated pupil to take a lesson from the fate of good and of bad kings, as shown in the narrative. He hoped that the mothers of Scotland might yet say of him, as they did of the good King David, that they desired their offspring to be like him.

The more fascinating doctrines of passive obedience and divine right instilled by his favourite seemed speedily to have obliterated the rigid republican maxims of Buchanan, even if they ever found tolerance with the boy. It is difficult to trace the subtle agents which, influencing opinion, spread till they rouse masses of men to action. But as there is little doubt that Buchanan's writings had great influence on one side of the civil war of the ensuing century, it is not an extravagant supposition, that the whispers of him who was his successor in the formation of the royal mind may have had their influence in the creation of the opinion and conduct which provoked the contest.

We may return to the king at St Andrews, surrounded by a host more to his liking than his recent guardians. There were no hasty measures; and Arran, who was the soul of the new enterprise, did not for some time appear at Court. The English embassy was strengthened by the presence of the great Walsingham. There was the old interminable correspondence, in which, however, we find the following tolerably distinct summary of the reasons why the king should surround himself by persons acceptable to Queen Elizabeth: "I laid before him, that being drawn from her majesty, he might peradventure fall to

¹ Melville's Diary, 120, 121.

hostility with her that was of greater puissance than his force could resist without the succour of strangers, who, repairing into the realm, might give just occasion to his people to take arms rather to withstand them that could overthrow the religion, and make thrall their king and themselves, than to enter into wars with her majesty that had delivered them oftentimes from their greatest extremities, and offering now all friendship without any wrong or violence, but ready to maintain the religion, king, and nation in safety.”¹

The ambassadors were empowered to offer the young king a pension of ten thousand crowns; but it was rejected as too paltry for the acceptance of a king.²

The ambassadors seem to have had some influence in favour of moderate measures. In a declaration touching the Raid of Ruthven, read to the Estates, the king said he had made to these ambassadors and to others promises of clemency towards those who had mishandled him, to be kept if they would “acknowledge their offences and return to their due obedience;” for he desired to act “rather as a father seeking to recover his children, than a sovereign prince in a commonwealth respecting his estate and surety.”³ The children, however, would be at mischief again. There

¹ Correspondence, 511, 512.

² “He did declare to me, that albeit his Council, deliberating upon the only point of the quality of this pension, did think the portion to be esteemed so small as it might not with honour be publicly received by him with the advices and consents of them our councilors, who in open council and actions ought to have chief regard to the conditions of honour, leaving thereby the matter to his own choice and private dealing with her majesty. Yet he found her majesty’s kind offer to be accompanied with such signs of her loving affection towards him, . . . as therefore he resolved to receive this or any less sum in as good part as if it had been a matter of most high value.”—Bowes’s Correspondence, 484. “In my late conference with Colonel Stewart in the fields, he showed me plainly that the lords and Council, with the king, did esteem the portion granted by her majesty to the king to be so small as they thought he might not with honour receive it, offering that rather than he should take such a trifle, they would at their own charges provide double as much for him.”—*Ibid.*, 494.

³ Act Parl., iii. 330.

was much restlessness among them and several alarms. At last a sufficient force was collected by the Ruthven lords to seize Stirling Castle. The king was not there but in Edinburgh. Arran, a man of resources, managed to gather twelve thousand men—a large army, in that time of broken and confused parties, to be brought under the royal banner. When they marched towards Stirling, the new occupants of the castle found it hopeless to contend with so large a force, and moving southwards took refuge across the Border.

They were joined by others, who had fears in consequence of their share in recent events. “The banished lords,” as they were called, were for a short time an isolated community, with a curious interest attaching itself to their position and conduct. A method of dealing with public men whose conduct was counted suspicious or offensive rather than criminal prevailed at that time in Scotland, having, no doubt, been copied from the French Relegation. In distinction from deportation, which, like our transportation, meant compulsory removal to a foreign soil, relegation meant an injunction to abide in one’s own country, within or beyond certain limits, as policy might dictate in each particular case. In France it was usual to relegate a great man to his estates; but that was the very last place that would be assigned as the residence of such a person in Scotland. Several of the refugees to England had evaded such orders of removal. The Earl of Angus, for instance, had been ordered to live beyond the Spey. His personal comfort seems to have been considered. Within a week he was to be beyond the Forth; but a full month was allowed for his settlement in the far north. The reason assigned by the king for this was, “for removing of bruits and occasion of casting and alteration of the Court, whereof we can nowise like.”¹ We have seen, on the other hand, that Durie the minister was permitted to go where he pleased, provided he remained beyond the bounds of Edinburgh, where his power of giving trouble lay. There was another method of dealing with the

¹ Calderwood, iii. 749.

political transgressor, more stringent, but still falling short of seizure and imprisonment. He was ordered to "ward" himself in one of the royal castles, where, of course, he would find himself under restraint.

The new Government determined to do battle with the privilege of perfect freedom of speech claimed by the clergy, and to bring the question up in the person of their leader, Andrew Melville. He was cited to appear before the king and Council. His nephew thus sketches the scene: "He declined the judicature of the king and Council, being accused upon no civil crime or transgression, but upon his doctrine uttered from pulpit. The while, when the king and Captain James—then made Great Chancellor—with roarings of lions and messages of death, had taken so hot that all the Council and courts of the palace, were filled with fear, noise, and bruits, Mr Andrew, never jarging [flinching] nor dashed a whit, with magnanimous courage, mighty force of spirit, and fouth of evidence of reason and language, plainly told the king and Council that they presumed over boldly in a constitute estate of a Christian Kirk, the kingdom of Jesus Christ—passing by and disdaining the prophets, pastors, and doctors of the kirk—to take upon them to judge the doctrine and control the ambassadors and messengers of a king and council greater than they and far above them. The students of the history of the Reformation abroad will notice in this almost a translation of the language held by Calvin and Farel to the authorities at Geneva.

Melville's next point must have somewhat puzzled and embarrassed the new chancellor and the other courtiers. He laid down a Hebrew Bible, and determined to try conclusions on that, and that only. Perhaps there was a touch of irony in the act; but his brethren would have pronounced it to be in strict literal conformity with the standards of their Church, which admit of no translation of the Bible as an authorised translation, and refer all questions to the original text. Melville was ordered to ward himself in the Castle of Blackness. He preferred, however, to trust his safety to the other side of the Border,

and accomplished this object in a manner creditable to his wordly sagacity and ingenuity.¹

It was a short time after this event that Angus, Mar, the Master of Glamis, and the other "banished lords" who had fled from Stirling, reached England. The whole group, with the two Melvilles, took up their abode at Newcastle. They made altogether a compact little congregation, affording an opportunity for experimenting on the organisation of a new Church. It was the story of Calvin and Geneva repeated in miniature. It was resolved to seize the opportunity for establishing in a perfect working shape that "discipline" which was appealed to with characteristic frequency in the ministerial communings of the day. A staff of elders and deacons was organised. The function of the elders was "censuring and overseeing of manners, and rebuking in private all such as behaves themselves, in speaking, doing, gesture, or otherwise than it becomes holy and faithful Christians. And in case of no amendment, after two or three admonitions, or public offence and slander ensuing, to delate them to the Assembly or session, whereby they may be brought to repentance, and make public satisfaction." The kind of acts to be specially looked after were "where a gentleman shall name the devil, banning, pronounce an oath, filthy talk, or any ill-favoured speech." Perhaps not the least oppressive of all the rules was, that every one, great and humble, "shall be present at all the exercises of the Word and prayer." There were "special inspectors and noters of the absents;" but there was a possible exemption from this rule: "If one hath a necessary errand to do, whereby it behoveth him to be absent, let him advertise ane of the ministers or elders, and he shall be excused."²

This rigid programme reminds one of the instructive fact, that in some Churches, and especially those of the Huguenots, the time of suffering and danger is ever that of sternest internal despotism. The fiercer the fire of persecution through which it passed, the sterner became the iron discipline. Such a Church was like an army in

¹ Melville's Diary, 142 *et seq.*

² Ibid., 183, 184.

time of war, and an army in danger and difficulty. Hence opposition to the will of the rulers was mutiny and desertion; and the culprit would incur all the danger and social degradation of being cast forth from the compact little body within which were his best chances of safety. Of the bulk of the class to which these rigid rules were applied, it may be said that it would be difficult to find in the Christian world men with less religion or more ruffianism. Yet Melville, when he served these regulations on them, says, "They accepted very well thereof, and gave me great thanks; and causing it to be notified to all their company, they submitted themselves heartily to the order, humbly embracing the admonitions and directions."

To show to what point of perfection the rough material which the clergy had to deal with could be brought, we are furnished with a model instance in the Earl of Angus, a young man about twenty-two years old: "This nobleman was felon well-minded—godly, devout, wise, and grave; and by and besides the common exercises, was given to reading and private prayers and meditation; and ordinarily after dinner and supper had an hour's and sometimes more nor two hours' conference with me about all matters—namely, concerning our Kirk and common-well—what were the abuses thereof, and how they might be amended. Whereof he was so careful that he caused me set them down in write and present them to him."¹

That there was some reality in this is shown afterwards in Melville making an exception of Angus when he mourns the backsliding of the others. The effect of all their discipline and devotion was, that when they were restored to favour, the king remained as hostile as ever to the true Church, "partly because he perceived that the noblemen were not very earnest in the matter, getting their own turns done, as indeed—except the good Earl of Angus, to whose heart it was a continual grief that he could not get concurrence—there was little or small care among them thereof, for all the vows and fair promises made to

¹ Melville's Diary, 185.

God and His servants, the whilk the Lord in mercy make them to take till heart in time, and repent before the last come, whilk cannot, in His just judgment, be more fearful than the first.”¹

Though Angus and the other banished lords had thus escaped to a place of safety, the real head of their party, Ruthven, was left in extreme peril. Arran and he were now standing face to face in deadly struggle. The life and fortune of the one was to be in the ruin and death of the other. The king made a State visit to Ruthven Castle, “to let the country see that he was entirely reconciled to the Earl of Gowrie.”² Arran was at that time still in custody or restraint. In the struggle Gowrie had thus, to appearance, the firmer hold; but the king’s hand was at work relaxing it. Sir James Melville tells how, “so soon as the Earl of Arran got presence of his majesty, he not only stayed at Court against promise,” but also put an end to certain private consultations between Melville and his master “to do all his alain, albeit at his first entry he used himself humbly.” He speedily made himself master at the council board. He did the young king’s business there for him, having “put in his majesty’s head that he would find it a fashious business to be encumbered with many contrary opinions; but willed him to take his pastime at hunting, and he should tarry in and hear us, and report again at his majesty’s returning all our opinions and conclusions. This he observed two or three times, and in short space changed that order, and took no man’s advice but his own.”³ To the Council he spoke as representing the king, and as the bearer of his commands; to the king he professed to carry the desires of the Council. In this way he worked both powers against his enemy. The king was roused to excessive wrath against those who had roughly handled his anointed person; and it is of importance for the understanding of subsequent events that he spoke of Gowrie with vindictive

¹ Melville’s Diary, 225, 226.

² Sir J. Melville’s Memoirs, 29.

³ Memoirs, 294. “Fashious,” troublesome—one of the few common Scots words taken from the French, and still in use.

hatred rather as a personal enemy than an offender against the Government.

Gowrie thought it might be a wise step to leave Scotland. It might be wise for his personal safety, but not for that of his estates. Thus he was infirm of purpose, and loitered at Dundee, where he was to take ship, occasionally visiting his noble domains on the borders of the Highlands. We first make acquaintance with Ruthven giving filial aid to his father in the disposal of "Signior Davie." We now find him wandering over the borders of the Tay, the patrimony of his house, pensive in the prospect of bidding farewell to them, and his gallery "but newly built and decorated with pictures"—a rare possession for a Scots baron of that period. He was classical in his tastes; and in his communings with a friend who joined him in his solitude, he moralised, in the words of Mantuan Melibæus, on who may be the rude stranger who is to possess the fields beloved in vain.¹

While he remained north of the Tay it was not easy to lay hands on him. The upper part of the country was all his own; in the lowlands round Dundee his colleague Mar reigned. The plan adopted for his seizure was to send Colonel Stewart to Dundee by ship with a hundred men. Ruthven fortified himself in his house with a few retainers, and held out for some hours. This alone, if he had done nothing else, was in the eye of the law treason. From this point we have notes by some bystander, who saw much of what he describes, and sent his account as information to England. There was a determination to put Gowrie to death as speedily as this could be accomplished by form of law. Abundant evidence could be had of acts involving treason. But it appears to have been the conclusion of Arran and his followers, that it would be impolitic to lead evidence, whether from the necessary delay in bringing up witnesses, or because too much might be revealed in their testimony. Accordingly Arran re-

¹ "Impius hæc tam culta novalia miles habebit?
Barbarus has segetes."

—See Godscroft's House of Douglas, ii. 318.

newed old friendship with his enemy, and spoke of a desire to repay past services. The king, he said, wanted Gowrie's life, but it was his own wish and that of the others to save it. That, however, could only be accomplished if he made submission and confession. In the words of the narrator :—

“‘We would gladly,’ said they, ‘do anything for you we could ; but to deal directly in that cause, it should procure unto ourselves the king’s displeasure.’

“Quoth Gowrie, ‘If ye will not do for me, let me have your good counsel whom other ye think meetest that I should have recourse to.’

“‘Certainly,’ said they. ‘The only mean that we think is left to your lordship whereby you may have respect to the preservation of your life, and insinuate yourself in his majesty’s good grace, is this, to write a general letter unto his highness, showing that you have been of the privy council of some conspiracies intended against his majesty’s own person, and if it might please his majesty to suffer you to have access to speak with his highness, you would open up the specialties of the matter unto him.’

“‘Nay,’ said Gowrie, ‘that shall I never do ; for so I should promise the thing which I could not discharge myself of. I should confess an untruth, and put myself in a far worse case than I am in. I will rather trust in the simplicity of mine honest cause and upright meaning, and take my hazard as it shall please God to dispone upon me.’”¹

These words show that the man of blood and violence had at his service, when needed, certain dignified sentiments, with the faculty of expressing them in fitting terms. This tone he kept to the last. He knew that his doom was settled and that angry struggling would be of no material use. He continued to argue about the danger of an avowal ; but he got the conclusive answer, “Whether such things be or no, ye must confess the foreknowledge of them, or else it is concluded you shall die.” Then we are told : “‘Goes it so hard with me?’ says Gowrie : ‘if

¹ Archæologia, xxxiii. 161.

there be no remedy, in case I had an assured promise of my life, I would not stick to prove the device of the letter.' 'I will then,' sayeth Arran, 'upon mine honour, faithfully promise you that your life shall be in no danger if ye so do.'" ¹

He gave the letter, and it was produced against him at his trial. When he pleaded the promise of life, there was a scene thus described: "The advocate said it was not in the nobleman's power to promise life. 'Yea,' said he, 'the king promised unto them, which they avowed unto me by their oath.' 'Ask them,' says the advocate. He inquired of them; they denied that such promise was made by the king to them, or by them to his lordship. 'What, my lords! ye will not say so! Ye made faith to me by your honour otherways. I refer it to your oath and conscience. I am assured ye will not deny it.' They swore it was not so. 'This is a strange matter,' says my lord, 'that neither promise nor law avail; yet, my lords, I direct my speech unto you all. I pray you go to the king to know his mind towards me,' which they refused. After consultation then, he pressed every one severally, and the Earl of Arran himself—he could not prevail." ²

The proceeding showed how easily in Scotland at that time the established precautions for the protection of the innocent by means of deliberation and formality could be broken through by the strong hand. He pleaded that by law a certain period runs between the serving of the indictment and the trial. In ordinary crimes the period was fifteen days, but in treason it was forty days; yet he was brought instantly to trial. There was an old law or usage, that the murderer caught in the act—"red hand," as it was called—could be tried instantly and hanged. The rule, keeping its significant name, extended to other crimes than murder. When, therefore, he pleaded the illegality of the summary trial, "the advocate replied that the answer was not relevant; for a thief stealing red hand, and, *actu ipso*, may be taken without summons—meikle mair he in treason when he is with red hand of the crime." ³

¹ Archæologia, xxxiii. 162.

² Ibid., 168, 169.

³ Ibid., 168.

Farther, the "bulwark of liberty," the trial by an impartial jury, was made a trial by enemies.

Arran himself sat on that jury or "assize," along with Argyle, Crawford, Montrose, and others his supporters.¹ More, perhaps, to shame his enemy than for any chance it afforded, the victim demanded that this enemy should take the special oath of impartiality, and Arran took the oath in a full and explicit manner. The narrator goes on: "The other smiled, and called for a drink at the assize's departure, where I heard him, being behind him, request a gentleman cause his friends conceal his death from his wife till she were of more strength." She had just borne to him a son, into whose heart the tradition of the words that are to follow took deep root. Keeping up the deportment of easy good-humour, he said: "My lords, I am willing to lose my life to bring the king contentment, as I often before did hazard it to do him service. But the noblemen who were upon my assize, in condemning me, hazard their own souls; and see that my blood be not upon the king's head. The longer that I lived I should been involved in the greater care, and wrapped in the more miseries; and now [I am] freed from the fiery affairs of the Court, whereof I would have committed myself long since if I could. I remit my adversaries, and commit my revenge to God. My lord judge, the points whereof I am condemned are small oversights, and so it will be known afterwards. I pray you to make not the matter so heinous as to punish it with the penalty of forfeiture. My sons are in my lands—the second is confirmed in all his rights by the king's majesty." He was told that a conviction of treason must be followed by the usual doom of forfeiture. He was just allowed time to take spiritual consolation from his minister, and to pray privately. After the usual courtesies to the "hangman," he "smilingly put his head under the axe; and his body and blood, kept in the scarlet, was put in the chest and conveyed to his lodging." In these words we see that he was beheaded by "the Maiden" or guillotine.²

¹ Pitcairn, i. 116.

² *Aichæologia*, xxxiii. 170. The documents here cited are to be

Distant and safe as the banished lords appeared, the law had ministers that could reach them and inflict serious injury. With the usual elaboration of process, these banished lords and their principal followers were charged to appear, "put to the horn," and outlawed.¹ Estates covering a large portion of the kingdom were thus placed at the disposal of the Crown. Internal revolutions, however, followed each other so rapidly, that the party in power were not allowed time enough to complete the formal procedure for the distribution of the spoil.

These events were of course matter of extreme displeasure to Queen Elizabeth and her Government. There was therefore a renewal of the old tedious diplomacy. It was thought necessary again to send to Scotland so important a person as Secretary Davison. A solemn conference was held between Arran and Lord Hunsdon, Queen Elizabeth's cousin, within the parish church of Foulden. It became memorable by the pomp in which the new favourite appeared, and by the length of his train of followers, numbered at five hundred men. The most

found in "Observations on the Trial and Death of Willam, Earl of Gowrie," by John Bruce, printed in the 33d volume of the *Archæologia*. One of the MSS. cited by Bruce is also in the Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 91.

There was one item in the indictment having scarcely any historical bearing, yet curious as an indication of that suspicion ever hovering about the house of Gowrie, of dealings with the Satanic community. This point was witchcraft, or, as it is termed, "coffering with sorcerers." He explained that one of his retainers from Dunkeld had brought him a warning from some weird woman there, who asked him how it fared with Ruthven; and he saying "well," she rejoined, "No; there is some ill fallen to him that he knows not. The king's favour is withdrawn from him, and by the lady of Arran, and yet there may be remeid for it if my lord list." He refused, he said, to profit by the warning, saying: "If the woman were here, I were content she were brent, and would be the first would confess to it. If there be any witchcraft used, I think it be more near the Court." —*Archæologia*, xxxiii. 169.

¹ See the process at length in Pitcairn, i. 119. A pretty long list of names, beginning with Mar and Angus, will afford to such as are anxious in the matter those secondary leaders in the projects of the party who found flight desirable. The name of Douglas predominates among them.

conspicuous practical point in the discussions between the two Governments was, a demand on the part of Scotland that the banished lords might be delivered up to the king's Government. We must suppose this to have been a bravado, to show England that dictation was preposterous. It is difficult to suppose that such a demand could be seriously made, when it is remembered that the Government of Scotland ever repelled all demands for the extradition of English political refugees; and the correspondence about the embassy of Bowes is expanded by his vain attempts to get possession of an Englishman named Holt, charged with accession to Romish conspiracy in England. It is true that the Earl of Northumberland was sent to England to his fate. The Government might have interfered for his protection, and became unpopular for not so doing; but he was in reality the property of a private captor, who ostensibly acted for himself.

It is unnecessary to follow the diplomatic correspondence through its intricacies, since it was destitute of either of the two conditions that confer interest on such negotiations—that they lead to some great result, or that they deal with elements so perilously convulsive that any slight touch of skill or any casual mistake might produce portentous results. Scotland still remained as the country had become at the taking of the Castle of Edinburgh—safe from danger from without, and untrammelled by any critical foreign policy. Perhaps, had there been more to fear from without, the kingdom would not have been shaken by internal revolutions so rapid and capricious. At this time, too, in the diplomacy between England and Scotland, one begins to trace a new and soothing influence likely to modify extreme conclusions—it is shown in hints about English courtiers inclining to propitiate the rising sun.

As the diplomacy wears through the year 1585, it begins to have more colour and interest. A new favourite had appeared on the horizon. Esmé Stewart d'Aubigné, the son of the old favourite, had just come from France to visit or abide at the Court of Scotland, as events should

run. It was not he, however, who became the hero of the present occasion. He had brought with him a young man who had for some time been his companion, and who had thus gained an opportunity, by which he was able to profit, of acquiring the polish and accomplishments, with some of the other qualities, of a Parisian courtier. This was Patrick Gray, who, as the son of the baron of that name, took, by the national custom of Scotland, the title of Master of Gray. He was, if we may believe contemporary accounts, a model of manly beauty. The king, just growing into manhood, was acquiring that offensive ugliness which even the Court painters could not help revealing if they produced what could be recognised as a portrait. The ugliness was offensive, because it had none of those qualities which give an interest, and sometimes even a dignity, to ugly faces—as intellect, firmness, or even sternness. But he delighted in having handsome men about him, and good looks were a sure passport to his favour. This weakness seems to have come of the same peculiarity of nature, unaccountable on any reasoning from cause and effect, which makes unseemly people take delight in the fine clothing and brilliant jewellery which only draw attention to their defects. Gray attended Arran at the meeting with Lord Hunsdon at Foulden church, and there he seems to have told the English lord, that if he were sent ambassador to England, as he expected to be, he could do Queen Elizabeth some special services not connected with his ostensible embassy.

He had an accommodating conscience, which fitted him for any treachery or mischief that could be made worth his while. Hunsdon, writing to Cecil, said of him: “That man, for being grete with the Scotch queen, and for being a Papist, I know he can say much about the Scottish queen—few men more: but for his Papistry, I wish all ours were such; for yesterday, being Sunday, he came to church with me, having a service-book of mine, sitting with me in my pew, he read all the service, and both before the sermon and after he sang the psalms with me as well as I could do; whereby, it seems,

he has been used to them, or else he could not a-done it so well and so readily now, let his religion be what it will." ¹

Soon afterwards he was sent on the expected mission to the Court of England, where he had confidential meetings with the queen and her advisers. He was in possession of many of poor Queen Mary's dangerous secrets. He knew much as a person in the confidence of the Guises, but he obtained still more as her accredited agent; and it is said that she trusted to some propitious result to her own cause from the favour shown to him by her son. It stands as a charge against the young diplomatist, from which he was never able to clear himself, that he revealed all this knowledge to the English Court, and helped materially in furthering the coming tragedy. Meanwhile we shall presently meet him again on Scots ground.

If Scotland might at that juncture be counted free of immediate danger from without, it was not so with England. It was there that the new power which had risen against Catholic Europe could be struck on the head; and there the danger of the first, and, as it might be, the last, blow was most keenly felt. Philip of Spain was slowly making his preparations, and Elizabeth had given him provocation and justification for whatever he might do by active intervention in the Netherlands war of independence. The Protestants in their covenants and bands had set the example of a new political power. It was not the old-fashioned alliance of monarchs, but a combination which swept into one group the local aristocracy, the clergy, and the people. The example was followed on a grand scale in the terrible Catholic league, of which the Pope was the spiritual head and the Duke of Guise the military leader. Under its pressure all concessions granted to the Huguenots were withdrawn by the revocation of the edict of pacification. The league was waxing towards that power which was to shake the throne of France, and in the end bring retribution on itself; but meanwhile it was subduing and persecuting the Huguenots, and

¹ Papers regarding Master of Gray, 12.

threatening the cause of Protestantism, and especially England, the refuge and defence of free thought.

It was felt necessary to cultivate the friendship of the Court of Scotland without too nice an estimate of its merits. That Arran was supreme, and his opponents banished, was a condition to be regretted; but in the pressing danger such little differences must not stand in the way of co-operation. In the middle of April the sagacious statesman Edward (afterwards Lord) Wotton was sent to Scotland. He was a man of genial hearty nature, but withal a courtier. He loved the chase, and knowing that King James and he would have here at least a common feeling, he brought with him an acceptable gift of choice horses and dogs. But he had more serious business in hand. He was to press on the notice of the Court the determination of the Papal powers to crush the Protestant cause, and to point to a necessity for Protestant princes uniting in a league for their common defence. The king was to be told that a strict league between Scotland and England for the maintenance of the Gospel would be very acceptable to the queen. He was, to a certain but apparently rather limited extent, authorised to offer a subsidy.¹ There was some discussion at the time about the king receiving an English peerage with its domains.

Up to this point Arran's power had been ever growing, and he was beginning to flaunt it before the older nobility with a vain insolence which hinted that his elevation had brought giddiness on his once cool and sagacious head.

He was Lord High Chancellor; the occasional office of Lieutenant-general of the kingdom was made for his use; and he was governor of the two chief fortresses, Edinburgh and Stirling. It was noticed that he professed to belong to the blood-royal, the Stewarts of Ochiltree being descended from Murdoch, Duke of Albany. The descent was tainted by the bar sinister; yet, according to a document preserved by a genealogical antiquary, he maintained the descent to be legitimate, and claimed as

¹ Calendar of State Papers (Scotland), i. 494.

his birthright precedence over all the other nobility.¹ According to Secretary Davison, his infamous wife was prowling about the Crown jewels, and trying which of Queen Mary's robes best became her.² It was reported that the two, in a partnership of rapacity, kept a steady eye on all possible forfeitures and other means of enlarging their power and wealth.

We find Davison writing about Arran, on the 30th of September, in these expressive terms: "It is incredible how universally the man is hated by all men of all degrees, and what a jealousy is sunken into the heads of some of the wisest here of his ambitious and immoderate thoughts, which they suspect to reach beyond the king's life in a degree the world doth not yet dream of, as your honour shall hear more hereafter, wherein, besides divers speeches falling out of his own mouth—some to myself, some to others—of his lineal and lawful descent to the earldom of Arran, and consequently to whatever right that house can claim, 'as he understand it,' in this crown, and of the entailing of the crown by Parliament—wherein if the young duke be admitted a first place, he claimeth a second; his actions, as in recovering into his hand the principal strengths of the country, with the whole munition, ordnance, jewels, and wealth of this crown. His usurped power and disposition of all things, both in Court, Parliament, and sessions, at the appetite of himself and his good lady, with many other things to bewray matter enough to suspect the fruits of ambition and inordinate thirst of rule."

The "good lady" is called "a woman generally accused of sorcery, and laden with the infamy of other vices."³

¹ Crawford's *Officers of State*, 448. "It is well known to sundry here present, who are ready to attest the same, that the Lord Ochiltree, the said earl's father, is lawfully come of the royal blood, as lineally descended from father to son of the house of Evandale, whose first progenitor not long synsyne was son to Duke Murdoch, begotten in lawful bed."

² Papers regarding Master of Gray, 3.

³ *Archæologia*, xxxiv. 211. This evil character of Arran, in the estimation of English observers, had lasted for a full year. In certain

In the same paper he speaks thus of the young king's position and prospects: "I find infinite appearances that this young king's course, directed partly by the assured compass of his mother's counsel, and partly by the immoderate affections of some here at home, doth carry him headlong to his own danger and hazard of his estate. He hath, since the change at St Andrews, continually followed forth implacable hatred and pursuit against all such as in defence of his life and crown have hazarded their own lives, living, fortunes, and all that they have, and now throw himself into the arms of those that have heretofore preferred his mother's satisfaction to his own surety, and do yet aim at that mark, with the apparent danger of religion, which hath already received a greater wound by the late confusions and alterations than can be easily repaired."¹

To the English Court it was desirable to be rid of Arran, if this could be, without a quarrel with Scotland. Gray returned, and was in close counsel with Wotton on this head. It would appear that Gray contemplated the simple plan of murder. The English ambassador felt his position unpleasant when he heard such things mooted, and if there was to be mischief of that kind, had rather it had been finished before he came.

But the project of the league, with its transactions fair and foul, was interrupted by that ever-fruitful source of trouble, a Border outbreak.

Sir John Forster, warden of the middle marches of England, had a meeting of the usual kind, to settle disputes and difficulties with Kerr of Ferniehurst, who held the same office on the Scots side. One of the hangers-on of the English side was caught pilfering, and a disturbance

characters of leading men in Scotland, prepared it would seem by one of the English emissaries, in the year 1583, Arran is thus told off: "A man of more wit than courage, but of no faith, conscience, or honesty; insolent where he prevaieth, and of a restless and troublesome spirit; suspected of all men, and never favoured or trusted by any but his like; of no power, friends, or wealth but that he hath by his usurped earldom of Arran."—Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 61.

¹ Archæologia, xxxiv. 210.

began, which rose to a quarrel. The English were driven off, and Lord Russell, who was among them, was slain. According to the report of this affair believed in England, there were but three hundred present on the English side, while the Scots were three thousand, all fully armed. It was construed from this, that there was a plot to invade England, or do some other specific injury ; and in feeling for the planners of that plot, the English statesmen thought fit to bring it home to Arran, as well as to Ferniehurst.

Even in those days of rough diplomacy, when the supreme government of a country brought an accusation to the effect that one of its subjects had been murdered by the subject of another country, no rank or favour could stop the necessary process for trying the question. Thus a point was gained. Arran, as a man under a charge of heavy crime, could not ostensibly remain at Court. He was conveyed to the Castle of St Andrews ; but afterwards he was ordered or permitted to relegate himself in his own mansion of Kinniel, about twelve miles from Edinburgh. This was an arrangement at variance, as we have seen, with the policy towards the political enemies of the Crown. The way in which Ferniehurst met the charge is a curious example of a difficulty in Border disputes : " He avoided it by a flat denial, because the other could produce no Scottishman for a witness. For in these trials on the Borders, according to a certain privilege and custom agreed upon amongst the Borderers, none but a Scot is to be admitted for a witness against a Scot, and none but an Englishman against an Englishman ; insomuch that if all the Englishmen who were upon the place had seen the murder committed before their eyes, yet their testimony had been of no value unless some Scottishman also did witness the same."¹

This man, Kerr of Ferniehurst, has often crossed our narrative as an active partisan occasionally set to dark and desperate work. He was a refugee in England during the regency of Morton, who wrought hard to lay hands on him. In the letter in which Queen Elizabeth allowed the

¹ Camden in Kennet, ii. 504, 505.

Scots law to have its course against Grange after the capture of Edinburgh Castle, she refused to hand him over to Morton. Now, on the other hand, Wotton loudly demanded that he should be given over to Queen Elizabeth. It was believed that the real object of this demand was to fix a quarrel on Scotland, in order that it might break forth by the removal of the ambassador at the critical moment of the return of the banished lords. The destiny of events was, however, to take another shape. Ferniehurst died before there was any opportunity of deciding on the charge against him, and the great Camden has left this short but expressive testimonial to his qualities: "A stout and able warrior, ready for any great attempts and undertakings; and of an immovable fidelity to the Queen of Scots and the king her son; having been once or twice turned out of all his lands and fortunes, and banished the sight of his country and children, which yet he endured patiently, and after so many crosses falling upon him together, persisted unshaken and always like himself."¹

It came now under deliberation among Queen Elizabeth's advisers whether they should make this affair a ground of quarrel with Arran, and, without falling into a war with Scotland, assail him, by letting loose on him the banished lords, and in any other available shape. Before seeing these deliberations to a conclusion, however, it may be well to bring up to the present point certain ecclesiastical matters which were intimately connected with what followed.

Among many other Acts passed by the Parliament of 1584, were some for laying a restraint on the perfect independence, accompanied by a certain amount of absolute rule, claimed by some of the Presbyterian clergy. To make a propitious commencement, the first of these was an Act to confirm "the liberty of the preaching of the true Word of God and administration of the sacraments." The next referred to "seditious and contumelious speeches" uttered in the pulpit; and enacted that his majesty's authority, enforced through the established judicatories,

¹ Camden in Kennet, ii. 505.

shall have effect over "all persons his majesty's subjects, of whatsoever estate, degree, function, or condition whatever they be of, spiritual or temporal, in all matters wherein they or any of them shall be apprehended, summoned, or charged to answer in such things as shall be inquired of them."¹

The Estates seemed to have thought it imprudent to pass such an Act without a special reservation of their own old constitutional powers. It was put in the royal name like the other: "The king's majesty, considering the honour and the authority of his Supreme Court of Parliament, continued past all memory of men unto these days, as constitute upon the free votes of the three Estates of this ancient kingdom;" it is therefore provided "that the honour, authority, and dignity of the said three Estates shall stand and continue in their own integrity, according to the ancient and lovable custom observed in time by-gone, without any alteration or diminution."

Another Act was levelled against the legislative and judicial power assumed by the clergy when they met in Assemblies. It was declared that these were unauthorised innovations on the old constitution of the country, in which the Estates of Parliament were the supreme power. It was provided, that excepting the established judicatories, without royal licence, "nane of his highness' subjects, of whatsoever quality, state, or function they be of, spiritual or temporal, presume to take upon hand to convocate, convene, or assemble themselves together for holding of councils, conventions, and assemblies."²

These Acts, like many others of the Scots Estates, might have gone for little more than empty declamation; but it was resolved to lay a practical trap, of a kind not easily evaded and very powerful, for all defaulters. A declaration to obey these laws, and remain in due obedience to their Bishops, was appointed to be signed by all beneficed clergymen; and whoever refused to sign it forfeited his position and benefice.³

This test seems to have been rigorously put. The

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 293.

² Ibid., iii. 293.

³ Ibid., 347.

backsliders who accepted it were so numerous, and found in quarters so unexpected, as to distress and incense the zealous brethren. Some of the more subtle casuists among the subscribers added the words "according to the Word of God" before subscribing, on which there is this note by one of the sterner kind: "Some were deluded by simplicity, not taking up the sophistry of the clause which was added; others were content of any colour to blind the eyes of the people. The clause added to sophisticate the band was repugnant to the matter and argument of it. It was all one as if they would have said they will obey the Pope and his prelates according to God's Word."¹ The test seemed to be accepted on the one hand with the same facile conformity which carried the subscription to the Covenant through the lords of Lennox's and Arran's party. It is less hard, however, to understand such a phenomenon among easy-conscienced courtiers than among stern divines. Erskine of Dun, and Craig, the venerable and zealous coadjutor of Knox, joined in the defection, and seem to have promoted it: "Subscription going on apace—the examples of Mr Craig and John Brand have done much ill. The Laird of Dun was a pest then to the ministers in the north." This is followed by an anecdote which the historian of this backsliding seems to consider appropriate to his subject: "About the same time, the king coming from hunting, drank to all his dogs, and among the rest to one of his dogs called Tell True, saying, 'Tell True, I drink to thee above all the rest of my hounds; for I will give thee more credence nor either the bishop or Craig.' This was the great account he made either of the bishop or the subscribers."² But there was a day of triumph at hand for the steadfast and suffering remnant.

The Master of Gray, whose destiny it was to be the inspiring demon of the coming explosion, returned from his purposeless embassy to the place where he could really be of use. The sage counsellors of Queen Elizabeth were suggesting plans for diminishing Arran's influence with the

¹ Calderwood, iv. 247.

² Ibid., iv. 351.

young king ; but the Master, who knew better how State changes were effected in Scotland, threw back their lazy plans with sharp impatience, and told them to let loose the banished lords. Wotton, the English ambassador, liked not so sharp a crisis as this foreboded. He was to be an addition to the list of English ambassadors who found Scotland too hot a place for them. Telling Walsingham that he was in great danger, he continued : " Your honour knoweth what a barbarous nation this is, and how little they can skill of points of honour. Where every man carrieth a pistol at his girdle as here they do, it is an easy matter to kill one out of a window or door, and no man able to discover who did it. Neither doth it go for payment with those men to say I am an ambassador, and therefore privileged ; for even their regents and kings have been subject to their violence."¹ But when an ambassador was deeply engaged in plotting the destruction of the head of the Government to which he was accredited—not perhaps a good head, but still the prime minister of the kingdom—it might be questioned whether he was making his payment in genuine coin. It was a question with him whether he should declare a quarrel on the refusal to deliver Ferniehurst, or any other decent pretext, when the question was solved by a fortuitous conjunction of events ; and as these boded violence he took to flight.

The conjuncture was as follows : The exiled Hamiltons thought the crisis a favourable one for attempting to regain their estates. The favourite Arran was their natural enemy, as the possessor of their domains, and an upstart, who strutted before the world with the title of their ancient house. The two brothers hung about for some time on the English side of the Border, trying, as it would seem, how many of those who had been retainers of the house of Hamilton were likely to follow the banner of its representatives. A great feudal power had rapidly arisen on the western Border under the rule of the Lord Maxwell. That was now no longer his title—he was for a short time

¹ Cited, P. F. Tytler.

Earl of Morton, as invested with the honours and some of the domains of the great Regent. His clan had been long at feud with "the gentle Johnstons," as his neighbours were in courtesy called. At that period it was usual for the predominant family in any district to have, besides their isolated fortress, a house or hotel, as the French called it, in the chief town of the district. It was a provincial palace frequented by a provincial court. The Maxwells had for many generations held this kind of supremacy in Dumfries. For some object he had in view, Arran had got the king to recommend to the burgh of Dumfries to choose as their chief magistrate the head of the house of Johnston. "This purpose," says a chronicler of the day, "seemed to Lord John to be done for his ignominy and contempt; and therefore, by advice of his brother, Robert Maxwell, Captain of Castlemilk, he caused get sure intelligence of the prefixed day that they were to elect him upon—for against that day Maxwell had written to all his well-wishers and friends to meet him privily in Dumfries very timeous in the morning, whilk they did; and it was commanded them to attend upon Johnston's entry in the tolbooth, that how soon he had received his office, sworn, and been admitted, that at his forthcoming they should kill him."¹ Johnston got timely warning, and evaded the ceremony. He went to Court, and devised with Arran how to crush one who had now become their common enemy. He had the assistance of a hundred horsemen sent in the king's name to co-operate with his feudal force; but the power of Maxwell had not been rightly estimated—he scattered his enemies with some slaughter, and took prisoner the head of the house of Johnston.² He was now a rebel in arms, marked out for vengeance by Arran, and thus well qualified to be the coadjutor of the Hamiltons and the banished lords. He brought to their aid a thousand men.

In deference to the representations of the Government of Scotland, the banished lords had been removed from the Border, and were residing in Westminster. They

¹ *Historie of King James the Sext*, 209.

² *Ibid.*, 211.

were not yet in a position to drop their clerical partisans ; and so when the time had come for moving southwards and joining Maxwell and the Hamiltons, we are told how "they kepted a very earnest exercise of humiliation at Westminster, where many tears were poured out before the Lord."¹ The allies met at Selkirk, and with their adherents marched onwards to Stirling, eight thousand strong.

The Master of Gray, by his own account, was busy levying an army in the service of the king, the manner in which the service was to be effected being a junction with the force advancing to Stirling. He was called to Court while thus employed. He feared to go, but absence would have been suspicious. Arran, hearing alarming rumours, broke his ban at Kinniel and hurried to Court ; so there the two who, externally colleagues, were in heart and action mortal enemies, met. Gray believed that Arran would slay him wherever he could, were it in the king's presence. But there came relief in the alarm that the invading army had reached St Ninians, not two miles distant.² There was nothing for Arran but flight. He crossed Stirling bridge towards the Highlands with a follower or two, taking, as it was said, with him the key of the bridge-gate.³ The king, with the courtiers and attendants who thought it safe to remain with him, were huddled together in the castle, surrounded by an army which it was useless to resist. In answer to inquiries, the banished lords said they had come to offer their homage and humble duty to their sovereign. They were told that they might be received individually ; but this did not satisfy their loyal enthusiasm, which would not abide so protracted a process—they must prostrate themselves before him in a body. There was a great audience, some attendants surrounding the king, and the banished lords kneeling before him with a profusion of humility and duty, since they had

¹ Calderwood, iii. 381.

² "Relation by the Master of Gray concerning the surprise of the king at Stirling ;" Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 119.

³ Calderwood, iv. 381.

now the privilege of approaching to render that loyal homage from which their enemies had heretofore cruelly debarred them. "The king," we are told, "acknowledged there was no need of words—weapons had spoken loud enough, and gotten them audience to clear their own cause, from whilk they were debarred before. He confessed he had been long abused; that it was the mighty hand of God that had brought them in with so small bloodshed; and welcometh them with cheerfulness as it seemed."¹

The revolution was thus completed on the 4th of November 1585. On the 1st of December the Estates of Parliament assembled in Linlithgow. Their chief work was in checking the steps towards the completion of recent forfeitures, and cancelling such details of business towards that end as had been completed. Thus, like satellites, a group of restitutions in which families and estates were concerned clustered round the revolution in the central government. Conspicuous among these was the restoration of the Ruthven or Gowrie family to their vast estates. This was connected with an event which occurred a few years afterwards—an event rendering both the forfeiture and the restoration a matter of much pondering. Queen Elizabeth had specially interceded with King James for the widow and children. After noting the services done to himself and the Crown, she says: "We are the rather of pity and conscience moved to interpose our credit, earnestly to solicit that your ire incensed against his poor wife and thirteen fatherless children may be assuaged with his own execution; and to extend your royal clemency and compassion towards them, whose offence, as it could not merit, so could not their innocency bear, your indignation, nor their youth be thought worthy your wrath; that they being restored to enjoy their father's lands, rents, and possessions, under your obedience and protection, some monument of that ancient house may abide with the posterity, and that name be not rooted out from the face of the earth,

¹ Calderwood, iv. 392.

through the private craft and malice of their private adversaries."¹

Through the powers of forfeiture attached to the conviction of the earl on a charge of treason, his wife and children had been cast upon the world like insolvent peasants ejected from their holdings. The miseries and contumelies thrown on them excited scandal and sympathy in Scotland. Secretary Davison, when acting as ambassador from England, beheld a scene in the streets of Edinburgh which picturesquely illustrated the futility of his great queen's intercession, and he told it thus to Walsingham:—

"The poor Countess of Gowry, who since her husband's death is wasted with grief and affliction, met the king in litter beyond the water in his coming hitherward, and falling down before him to move his pity and compassion towards herself and her poor innocent children, hardly obtained the hearing of the king, who departed and gave her no answer; and with what inhumanity she hath been used since her coming to this town, by such as have been instruments of all her woe and calamity, I take shame to write. The same day she first compeared, she moved the most part of her judges to tears; but finding no grace, the next day, being the last of the Parliament, she returned to the place, purposing to tarry his majesty's coming; but commandment being sent to the constable in his highness's name for her removing out of the house, the poor lady, seeing no other remedy, was compelled to obey it, and being led forth into the open street, stayed there, his highness passing by, which was on foot, in respect of the nearness of his lodging, where, falling on her knees, and beseeching his majesty's compassion, Arran going betwixt her and the king, led him hastily by her, and she reaching at his cloak to stay his majesty, Arran putting her from him, did not only overthrow her, which was easy to do in respect of the poor lady's weakness, but marched over her, who, partly with

¹ Overtures from Queen Elizabeth—her request to the king for the house of Gowrie; Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 106.

extreme grief and partly with weakness, swooned presently in the open street, and was fain to be conveyed into one of the next houses, where with much ado they recovered life of her."¹

By a political revolution in which they could have had no part, the woman and her young children were endowed with wealth and territories that might befit a German sovereignty. The restoration was, according to legal style, in the king's name; but James was some years afterwards sharply reminded that the house of Gowrie owed him no gratitude.²

It fell to this Parliament to transact a weighty piece of national business—the conclusion of the league with England, interrupted by the disturbances on the Border. This was accomplished by a Parliamentary ratification, interesting and remarkable as a constitutional document both in its form and its substance. In England the right to represent the nation in questions of peace and war—in all transactions, indeed, of an international kind—had been assumed by or yielded to the Crown. The authority of Parliament only acted indirectly by attacking or defending the statesmen responsible for the national diplomacy; and when the constitution was perfected, all documents relating to the national diplomacy were claimed by Parliament, and laid before the Houses for discussion without delay.

In Scotland, on the other hand, the Estates tenaciously adhered to the privilege of originating and completing all affairs of peace and war. In this instance, in summer, when the English Government brought up the question of the league, there was no regular sitting of the Estates. A body, however, consisting of members of the Estates, formed themselves into a committee, and adjusted an arrangement to be laid before a full Parliament for ratification. This committee, in a written document subscribed by each of its members, authorised the king and his

¹ Papers relating to Patrick, Master of Gray, 2.

² Act in favour of the posterity of William, Earl of Gowrie; Act. Parl., iii. 399.

Council to represent the Estates of Scotland in concluding the league; and vindicated this exceptional process in the preamble, narrating the urgent danger of the Protestant cause from the combined action of the Popish powers, and "considering the great and urgent necessity of the said league, and how the same may be na langer protracted nor without peril deferred to a more solemn convention of the hail Estates in Parliament." The league, when completed, contained a remarkable reservation, which kept alive the ancient alliance with France, in these terms: "Providing always the said league be without infringing or prejudice in any sort to any former league or alliance betwixt this realm and any other auld friends and confederates thereof, except only in matters of religion, whereanent we do fully consent the league be defensive and offensive."¹

¹ "Ratification of the assent of the Estates for treating and concluding of a league with the Queen of England;" Act. Parl., iii. 381.

CHAPTER LIX.

TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN MARY AND THE
SPANISH ARMADA.

ENGLAND PREPARING FOR A BLOW — QUEEN MARY — HER ISOLATION FROM THE POLITICS OF SCOTLAND — INFLUENCE THROUGH HER NEGOTIATIONS AND PLOTS ON THE POLITICS OF ENGLAND — HER LIFE SINCE THE AFFAIR OF RUDOLPHI AND THE BISHOP OF ROSS PART OF ENGLISH HISTORY — GENERAL OUTLINE OF HER PERSONAL HISTORY AS A CAPTIVE IN ENGLAND — TUTBURY, LEEDS CASTLE, AND THE OTHER PLACES OF HER DETENTION — HER APPEALS TO ELIZABETH — HER HUMILITY — THE ATTACK OF SARCASTIC VITUPERATION — HER RENUNCIATION OF HER SON — HER CLAIM TO THE CROWN OF ENGLAND NEVER DROPPED — BEQUEATHS HER KINGDOMS TO PHILIP OF SPAIN — THE EXECUTION — HOW TAKEN IN SCOTLAND — PHILIP COMES TO TAKE POSSESSION — THE ARMADA — INCIDENTS IN SCOTLAND CONNECTED WITH IT — THE KING'S MAJORITY — HIS PACIFICATION PAGEANT — PLACID CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY.

THE conclusion of the league was to England a sort of clearing of the decks for action. A great blow had long been impending, and now the time had come when it was to fall.

For nearly twenty years the Scots people had now been so busy in making their own history in their own internal troubles and tendencies, that few seemed to remember the existence in distant captivity of that queen who, while she lived among them, so filled the ear of fame by her character and conduct as scarce to leave room for any other element of national history. The small remnant of the party that had held out for her down to 1572, had been gradually thinned by death, and they had virtually

no successors. Yet her historical career was not over. In the land of her imprisonment she became a power—and a very formidable power. Among the emissaries concerned in her plots there were doubtless a few Scotsmen—chiefly ecclesiastics of her own Church. But they were isolated agents, doing business for powers and combinations out of their own country; and their performances—busy as some of them doubtless were—do not come up on the surface of political councils and events in Scotland.

The plots in which the Bishop of Ross was concerned with the Italian were the last in which Queen Mary and her own realm of Scotland were both immediately concerned. All the others touched Queen Elizabeth and England. Doubtless, had any of them succeeded, Scotland would have participated in the results; but that did not bring them closer home to Scotland as national history, than any other possible revolutions or disasters that might have come on England. When her abode was finally destined to be in England, she carried with her to her new home the troubles and political excitement which attended her presence wherever she went. She thus ceased to belong, except casually, to the history of Scotland, and fell to be dealt with by those occupying a wider field as the historians either of England or of Britain at large.

When her captivity in England had just begun, and it was yet in the uncertain future whether it was to be a brief seclusion, or to last as it did to the end of her days, we have seen that she kept up her old favourite pastime of besieging the male human heart. She was ready to abandon Bothwell as a necessary condition for achieving a victory over Norfolk. Perhaps there was a new and exciting sensation in spreading nets for a lover who had never met her face to face, and could not see her during the wooing. And in the messages she was enabled to convey to him, through the difficulties in the way, there are touches likely, as they were slowly deciphered, to excite the mind of one who received them from a queen—and a queen whose history had been so full of marvellous incidents. Indeed, if they be correctly deciphered, her

love-letters to "My Norfolk" have even some faint harmony with the letters in the casket.¹

The Norfolk romance was extinguished on the scaffold. There yet remained to its heroine, however, some glimpses into that world of love-intrigue which was gradually closing for her. Leicester was spoken of; so was that other who so strangely shared with him the favours and hopes of the great arbitress over all—the Duke of Anjou, one of the two brothers on whom Queen Elizabeth heaped so much

¹ For instance: "Therefore, when you say you will be to me as I will, then shall you remain mine own good lord, and as you subscribed once, with God's grace; and I will remain yours faithfully, as I have promised. And in that condition I took the diamond from my Lord Boyd, which I shall keep unseen about my neck till I give it again, to the owner of it and me both. I am bold with you because you put all to my choice; and let me hear some comfortable answer again, that I may be sure you will mistrust me no more. And that you will not forget your own, nor have anything to bend you from her; for I am resolved that well nor woe shall never remove me from you if you cast me not away. And if I am suspected by you meaning so truly, have I not cause to be sorry and suspicious? Judge yourself what you see so far, that it is time to you to run another course, I had failed to you; and yet if you be in the wrong, I will submit me to you for so writing, and ask you pardon thereof. But that fault I could not forbear for very joy. Now Huntingdon goes up. Beware of him; he loves neither you nor me."—December 1569; Labanoff, iii. 5. "I pray you, my good lord, trust none that shall say that I ever mind to leave you, nor do anything that may displease you, for I have determined never to offend you, but to remain yours; and though I should never buy it so dear, I think all well bestowed for your friendly dealings with me undeserved. So I remain yours till death, according to my faith and dutiful promise. I look for goodwill and constancy again; so I pray God, as I do daily, to save you from all our enemies."—*Ibid.*, 12. "You have promised to be mine and I yours; I believe the Queen of England and country should like of it. By means of friends, therefore, you have sought your liberty and satisfaction of your conscience, meaning that you promised me you could not leave me. If you think the danger great, do as you think best, and let me know what you please that I should do; for I will ever be perpetual prisoner, or put my life in peril for your weal and mine. As you please command me, for I will for all the world follow your commands, so that you be not in danger for me in so doing."—*Ibid.*, 19. Of the laborious character of Queen Mary's correspondence in cipher some idea may be formed from a fac-simile of a cipher letter, with its decipherment, in the third part of the National MSS. of Scotland, lviii.

motley flirtation. There were a few others equally ineligible. One was George Carey, related to Queen Elizabeth on the Boleyn side, and therefore an adventurer ready to accept whatever prize fortune might cast in his path. The heir of the house of Hamilton was among those named for the promotion; so was another, of totally different character and position—Charles V.'s illegitimate son, Don John of Austria, the renowned champion of Christendom.

But these things of necessity came to an end. Match-making is one of the cheerful hopeful occupations of open day, and does not easily fit itself into assassination plots and deep-laid conspiracies for the overturn of empires. Except to the dark spirits deeply working in such matters, the captive queen was a person forgotten. Yet it was in her isolation that she found work for herself, leaving in its traces still the most powerful testimony to the energy of her character and the fertility of her resources. Despite of every effort to isolate her, she continued able to touch such wires as could stir or shake the States of Europe.

She did so much else that it seemed to fill all her time, and leave her none for plotting. She worked much in embroidery, and wrote many letters. Her ostensible correspondence throughout her prison life ran in appeals to her rival, either directly or through the chief English statesmen. Though they may be said ever to be harping on the same key, there is so much passionate eloquence in these letters—they appeal so vehemently to the justice, the mercy, the good faith, the Christian feeling of her enemy—that they are read with keen interest, like those romances in which the actors pour themselves forth in imaginary correspondence.¹

¹ A specimen of these letters is here taken from one less known than the others, since it has even escaped the sweeping researches of Prince Labanoff: "Ha, madame, respectez votre honneur plus que la malice de mes amis, votre sang plus que les menaces de mes rebelles, votre promesse faveur plus que le supçon qui est vice à un prince, principalement quand c'est contre ceux qui ont fait telle preuve de sincère intention vers eux, comme j'ai fait preuve à vous, m'étant mise en votre pouvoir si librement. Or, maintenant je vous ad-

At other times her wailings take another and a less dignified tone. It is that of a spirit utterly broken and humbled. There is no anger, no reproaching, no longings for liberty. Submission is all she thinks of—to please and satisfy the arbitress of her lot is now the sole object of her enfeebled existence, if she knew but how to please and propitiate her. When we come to passages of this kind, we are pretty sure to find that they are contemporaneous with the most desperate projects of her scattered champions.

There is one letter to Elizabeth in which she comes forth in another spirit. It is neither that of the suppliant nor the martyr, but of the fierce enemy, using, and with terrible effect, the only weapon fate has left her. It is calumny pointed with sarcasm. As a specimen of vituperative irony, it may be counted a fair parallel to the casket letters as specimens of the impassioned and despairing. One could imagine the author of 'Candide' acknowledging in it the work of a kindred spirit. Pope, when he believes he will make Sporus tremble, rises to something like the same height of sarcastic vituperation. It describes horrible deformities in the moral nature which are denied activity by deformities in the physical structure. All is told in the spirit of exasperating compassion, for it is not her own story—she but repeats the malignant charges of the Countess of Shrewsbury; and thus she hits two enemies—the greater and the less—with one blow.

jourerai pour l'amour de Dieu, pour la pitié de mes longues troubles, pour notre parentage, pour la fiance mise en vous, pour votre honneur, pour le respect dû à une semblable, pour le requête d'une affligée, pour votre promesse faveur, pour l'amour des rois vos voisins mes alliés, et enfin pour l'amour de votre bon naturel et de vous même, à qui je suis plus proche qu'à nul autre, de mettre fin à mes longs ennuis. Vous assurant de moi mieux que par prison, assurez vous, je dis, de ma volonté, gagnant la cœur. Car par prison vous n'aurez que le corps, qui ne vous peut tant nuire, que m'ayant cœur et corps je vous puis servir. Je ne vous serais point ingrate amie ne dénaturelle sœur, et peut-être quelque jour mon amitié ne vous sera inutile." The end is: "Priant Dieu, madame ma bonne sœur, vous donner santé, longue et heureuse vie."—Chérueil, Marié Stuart et Catherine de Médicis, 56.

The picture she created of sensuality working for its gratification through craft and cruelty, might remind one of the scandals about the Empress Messalina; but it is more individual and distinct in its story. The imputations of personal vices and personal defects would now be counted a revolting specimen of the literature of its age; but it is skilfully shaded off by allusions to defects more innocent but scarcely less humiliating and stinging, since they were defects palpable to the courtiers gathered round the queen, and a suspicion of their existence cannot have been entirely absent from herself. The theme is the egregious extent of her vanity, her unappeasable appetite for flattery, which the most monstrous and ludicrous exaggerations cannot satiate. No tale of amorous devotion to her charms can fail of acceptance—even that Mary's own son, the youth of eighteen, would be subdued by them if political considerations suggested a union with the heir of both thrones. She was so resplendently beautiful that those who stood face to face with her shaded their eyes as if they looked upon the sun; and when farces were played among the frequenters of the Castle of Sheffield, representing the ludicrous scenes excited by her weaknesses—as they sometimes were—she, Queen Mary, shocked by the indecorums so offered to the person of a sister queen, did her best to suppress them.¹

This letter was not a mere petulant outbreak, the creation of feminine caprice. It was the utterance of actual rage, having a real foundation in bitter disappointment and hatred. The letter was written towards the end of 1584, just after all that she had lost and all that she fancied she had lost by the failure of the association scheme. Then nearer

¹ The genuineness of this letter was naturally often doubted, until it was settled by the zealous Prince Labanoff. He tells us that “c'est une très belle lettre autographe,” and proceeds: “Je l'ai examinée et collationnée l'année dernière dans la précieuse collection de M. le Marquis de Salisbury, désignée sous le nom de ‘Cecil Papers;’ et je suis intimement convaincu qu'elle a été écrite en entier de la main de Marié Stuart.”—Vol. vi. 56. Another doubt—whether the letter was permitted to find its way into Queen Elizabeth's hands—may still be held as unsettled.

home she had a bitter quarrel with Lady Shrewsbury, the wife of her custodian. On this occasion the poor captive had reason all too good for indignation. The lady had taken a jealous fit, and accused the captive of seducing her lord. The accusation was made in a form so real that the question of possible offspring was discussed. From this affair she came forth clear of taint, and she was entitled to indulge in any amount of virtuous indignation that such slanders should ever have been uttered.

A few months later she wrote another letter to Queen Elizabeth. It was inspired by irritation and anger from a fountain perhaps bitterer still, but not so capable of irritating and angering the receiver. It poured out her malediction on her son, who had outraged the laws of filial obedience and incurred the wrath of God. Foremost among the incitements to her fury at this time was, that her son was clearly committed to the heretic party; but that calamity she could not well bewail to Queen Elizabeth with any hope of sympathy. Even in what she did discharge in the shape of denunciations and threats against her undutiful offspring, her anger had overcome her prudence. She writes like the parent who, in a fit of irritation about an imprudent marriage or some other offence against parental views, communicates to his confidential friend his designs of condign punishment by disinheritance. In one sense such a threat by the parent holding his private property at his own disposal was more serious than Queen Mary's, because to a certainty it could be exercised if persisted in. Yet, like all acts of rage or folly by people in high places, her threat to disinherit her son afforded matter of alarming anticipation only too seriously realised. She would commit her rights to those who would be strong enough to hold them. It might be a vain threat, so far as it could affect the constitutional disposal of the crown, either of England or of Scotland, but it was sufficient to create a world of mischief.¹

¹ Several passages in this strange letter will reward attentive study. She puts the supposition: "Si je persiste à lui donner pour jamais ma malédiction, et le priver, autant qu'il sera en moy, de tout bien et

Besides the greater injuries denounced in her appeals, there was throughout her correspondence much querulous criticism on the fashion in which her cruel and unjust imprisonment was carried out—the sordidness of the appointments, and the rudeness of the attendants. As we have seen, the first place of residence or of imprisonment found for her after her flight from Scotland, was Bolton in Yorkshire. When the rebellion of the north broke out, she was considered here to be dangerously near it, and she was taken to Tutbury, in Staffordshire, the old fortress of the Lords of Lancaster. There she remained on this occasion but a few months. Her next destination was Chatsworth, in Derbyshire, a place noted for its magnificence in the present day. But the place of permanent detention must depend on the person who was to undertake the charge. That person was, we may believe, not to be easily found. Something of the old popular prejudice against the office of the jailer would pursue him, and yet it was necessary that he should be a man of rank and a statesman. The onerous duty was laid on Lord Shrewsbury. Chatsworth was a possession of the countess, but the chief residence of the Earl of Shrewsbury was Sheffield Castle, and thither Queen Mary was removed before the end of the year 1570. This was originally a castle or fortress; but there had been added to it vast buildings in the Tudor style, with pleasure-grounds and wide areas of forest, or, as it came to be termed, park. In the native country of which she was sovereign, Queen Mary could find no residence so magnificent and luxurious as her prison at Sheffield.

grandeur que, par moi, il peut prétendre, ny en Escosse ny ailleurs." And the conclusion is: "Je ne doubte point, pour en avoir preuve, qu'en la Chrestienté je ne trouve assez d'héritiers qui auront les ongles assez fortz pour retenir ce que je leur mettray en mayn." It is curious to connect this, so like a casual ebullition of feminine irritation, with the story of the Spanish Armada. Another denunciation is brief and emphatic: "Je luy osteray, avec le bon droit, la protection de Dieu, qui ne sçauroit, contre sa promesse favoriser à la fin telle impiété et injustice."—Labanoff, vi. 136, 137.

Other places, as connected with her arrival in England and with her end, are oftener associated with Mary Queen of Scots than Sheffield is; but here she remained for fourteen years, full twice the period of her abode as queen in Scotland. There cannot be much doubt that, had she composed her mind to reside here in peace, her rival would have gladly compounded to let her have comfort, enjoyment, and state. But she accepted the fortunes of war in preference to a life of dull repose. In 1585 it was necessary to remove her elsewhere. Wingfield, not far from Sheffield, was tried as a prison—for that was now to be literally the nature of her abode. It was not, however, sufficiently strong, and she was again conveyed to the dreary fortified mansion of Tutbury. Here only, in all the places of her detention, there seems to have been reasonable ground for complaint that the place was comfortless and unhealthy. It is the more difficult to know how far she had to endure real hardships here, as throughout she complained of unnecessary afflictions attending on her imprisonment. They assumed the most sordid shape—defective food and raiment, bad furniture, and neglected and decaying buildings,—all of them defects curable by money, and thus all of them the fruit of penuriousness and cruel meanness. Thrift was the great material feature of Elizabeth's Government. It was the praise on some occasions, but on others it was the scandal. Hence when parsimony was named, the charge was likely to receive a hearing. Yet of all charges made by prisoners against their jailer it is apt to be the most fallacious. It is the prisoner's natural retaliation—his most effective instrument for injury to the restrainer of his liberty. That he is in prison may be matter of political or legal necessity; but that while there he is starved and kept in rags and dirt is the personal act of his jailer; and his temper being soured and irritated by bondage, he attributes this additional suffering to greed or personal malice.

All our incidental knowledge on the entertainment and appointments of the captive queen leads to the inference

that they were on a liberal and costly scale.¹ If she lacked in anything, she had her own dowry as Dowager of France. The amount of this fund has been estimated at thirty thousand pounds a-year—that is to say, if realised in the gold coin of the day, the whole would weigh as much as thirty thousand sovereigns of our present coinage. But it is not capable of a precise estimate, since it was made up in great measure of the rents of seigneuries and other feudal rights, which could be made over to the dependants for whom she intended the proceeds, without being paid to herself. We can see, however, that the whole was on the scale of a State revenue rather than a private fortune; and her instructions to her “chancellor” and other high officers about its collection and disposal were after the fashion of State papers.² She paid her secretary Nau, and some others about her, from this source. It was not, however, her policy to let the money come in any considerable proportion to England. It was far more convenient that those employed in her political schemes should draw upon it at its source in France.

To return to Tutbury. Before the winter set in she was removed to the neighbouring mansion of Chartley.

¹ In the removal to Chartley in 1585, it is a question whether eighty or a hundred carts will be necessary to carry her own and her attendants' luggage (Froude, xii. 217). From accounts, whether old or modern, it is difficult to ascertain with precision how far the inmates of a dwelling have been made comfortable. We are told this, however, by one who had a large bundle of such accounts in his hands, and was better able perhaps than any other man to interpret them: “From these accounts it will be seen, that whatever charges may be brought against Queen Elizabeth in respect of her treatment of her unfortunate cousin, that of illiberality—at least during the latter period of her captivity—cannot be sustained. There was evidently a considerable train of household officers kept up, their entertainment was ample, and the whole establishment was probably better than any which Mary had had since leaving France.”—John Bruce, preface to ‘Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots,’ p. x.

² See “Declaration de mon intention sur la response qui a esté faite aux instructions de Sieur du Vergier mon Chancelier, et auctres poincts concernant les affaires de mon douayre.”—Labanoff, iv. 138.

It was here that the trap was laid in which she was caught. The place was open and accessible. Communication with her allies outside was naturally easy, and it was rather helped than interrupted, in order that a complete sweep might be made of the whole organisation. Such methods of detecting crime, or protecting governments from danger, have ever been distasteful to the public mind in Britain. It is believed that, like all secret operations, it may serve the purpose of personal enmity, and may strike the innocent as well as the guilty. Apart, however, from the large question whether the general policy of the English Government towards Queen Mary was just, it is clear that in this case the trap was not encumbered by the defects that are apt to ensnare the innocent, and that it caught the right victim. One of the chief reproaches of such an expedient is, that but for the temptation laid in the way, the innocent but weak victim would not have fallen from rectitude ; but here there was no question about falling from rectitude. What Mary was about was what she was determined to do if she could. Far from being a sin overtaking her in a moment of temptation, it was a grand duty to which she was urged by the highest sanctions of policy and religion. Nor was she the unsophisticated political enthusiast lured by the deeper traitor to go beyond the bounds of fair political warfare and dip in treason. There was no seduction into Walsingham's trap. It was skilfully laid, but no one could have fallen into it who had not determined to tread the path that led across it.

There were still to be three shiftings of abode in the short span of life remaining to her. She was taken to Tixall that Tutbury might be the more conveniently searched, and when the evidence to be found there was completed she was brought back. Her last removal was to Northamptonshire, where she was committed to the old Norman keep of Fotheringhay, ever memorable as the scene of the concluding tragedy of her tragic career.

Never has disputed point in history been subject to closer and more skilful scrutiny than Queen Mary's share in the great conspiracies brought to the light of day in

the year 1586. There are some questions which historical evidence is not powerful enough to complete to the satisfaction of devotees. The one great point on which the justice of putting Queen Mary to death is held to turn—her own part in the conspiracy to put Elizabeth to death—is in this position. If we suppose a certain cipher to have been forged by Walsingham's instruments, then the charge has not been proved.

Before that was done which could not be recalled, the probable shape of its acceptance elsewhere had to be considered. Granted that it was clearly for the interests of England that the Queen of Scots should die, yet those very interests required also the weighing of possible dangers from without. France was the natural champion of the fallen queen. The ancient league was not yet dead; and in the diplomatic doctrine of France, Mary was the sovereign whom it bound the ruler of France to assist in difficulties. But her party there—the Guises—were losing hold of their power, and indeed drifting to destruction. This Queen Elizabeth knew, and she set the French ambassador at scornful defiance when he put anything like a threat into his tone of remonstrance against putting Queen Mary to death. Then as to Spain, mighty preparations were in progress there; but there was no risk of any sudden blow from that quarter—the preparations would go on though Queen Mary lived; and if Philip were influenced by rational political considerations, the removal from the world of her who was the object of all might induce him to drop his project of invasion. Elizabeth's wise counsellors predicted, with an accuracy which was justified by the conclusion, how Scotland would take the event; and as to King James, how he might act does not appear to have been deemed material. He could not be supposed to have any deep affection for the mother whom he had last seen when he was not quite a year old. But the deed to be done was no less an injury and insult to his royal house; and a young man with any touch of the heroic or the chivalrous in his nature, placed as he was, might have taken a course very troublesome to a constitutional government.

He acted just as the spoilt boy who has got his hold on some glittering valuables, and is put in terror that some one may take them from him. He would do nothing to risk his chances of England. He knew, indeed, that his mother would sweep both crowns out of his reach if she could place them on the head of a sound champion of the old Church. He mumbled his sordid discontents on this point to Courcelles, the French ambassador. She had already by her plots put his prospects at risk. She must drink that which she had brewed; and he wished she would meddle with nothing but her prayers and serving God.

For very decency it was necessary that he should say something. He had as ambassadors at the English Court Archibald Douglas and Sir William Keith. They had conferences with Elizabeth herself and her advisers. We have not their instructions; but if they were a little warm in interceding, they do not appear to have ever threatened; and a short letter sent to them by King James, desiring them to "spare no pains nor plainness," says nothing that would justify them in using a threat.¹

In the interval between the pronouncing of the sentence on the 25th of October 1586, and its execution on the 8th of February 1587, the Master of Gray and Sir Robert Melville were sent on a special mission to Queen Elizabeth. Their instructions are in the mildest of tones, as if drawn with vigilant care to avoid aught that might be construed into a threat. She is solicited to reflect that her victim, "a sovereign princess, and in all degrees of the best blood in Europe, has been by subjects judged, yea, in life and title,—a dangerous precedent for all princes, and without any approved example in any age or kingdom." Queen Elizabeth is besought to remember what effect a fatal conclusion would have upon her character for gentleness—"what a blemish it would be to her reputation to descend so far from her accustomed clemency and natural mildness of her sex as to imbrue herself into her own

¹ Principal Robertson, Appendix, xlix. 1. ; Murdin's State Papers, 569 *et seq.*

blood." It is suggested that the king's mother might be kept in comfortable seclusion somewhere abroad, under assurances that she would cease to trouble England, or, in the phraseology applied to humbler persons, on finding security to keep the peace.¹

Such account as we have of the conferences under these instructions, forms a startling contrast to the smooth monotonous flow of diplomatic negotiations of the conventional kind. The Master thus tells the story of an interview with the Queen of England; and as Sir Robert Melville was present, and might have contradicted it if it were necessary or proper to do so, we may count that it is on the whole accurate :—

"The 9th day we sent to Court to crave audience, which we got the 10th day. At the first she said, 'A thing long looked for should be welcome when it comes; I would now see your master's offers.' I answered, 'No man makes offers but for some cause; we would, and like your majesty, first know the cause to be extant for which we offer, and likewise that it be extant till your majesty has heard us.' 'I think it be extant yet, but I will not promise for an hour; but you think to shift in that sort.' I answered, 'We mind not to shift, but to offer from our sovereign all things that with reason may be; and in special we offered as is set down in our general;' all was refused, and thought nothing. She called on the three that were in the house, the Earl of Leicester, my lord admiral, and chamberlain, and very despitefully repeated all our offers in presence of them all. I opened the last part, and said, 'Madam, for what respect is it that men deal against your person or estate for her cause?' She answered, 'Because they think she shall succeed to me, and for that she is a Papist.' 'Appearingly,' said I, 'both the causes may be removed;' she said she would be glad to understand it. 'If, madam,' said I, 'all that she has of right of succession were in the king our sovereign's person, were not all hope of Papists removed?' She

¹ "Instructions by King James to the Master of Gray and Sir Robert Melville;" Papers regarding Master of Gray, 120-125.

answered, 'I hope so.' 'Then, madam, I think the queen his mother shall willingly demit all her rights in his person.' She answered, 'She hath no right, for she is declared unhail.' 'Then,' I said, 'if she have no right, appearingly the hope ceases already, so that it is not to be feared that any man attempt for her.' The queen answered, 'But the Papists allow not our declaration.' 'Then let it fall,' says I, 'in the king's person by her assignation.' The Earl of Leicester answered, 'She is a prisoner, and how can she demit?' I answered, 'The demission is to her son, by the advice of all the friends she has in Europe; and in case, as God forbid, that any attempt cuts the queen here away, who shall party with her to prove the demission or assignation to be ineffectual, her son being opposite party, and having all the princes her friends for him, having bonded for the efficacy of it with his majesty of before?'

"The queen made as she could not comprehend my meaning, and Sir Robert opened the matter again; yet she made as though she understood not. So the Earl of Leicester answered that our meaning was, 'that the king should be put in his mother's place.' 'Is it so?' the queen answered; 'then I put myself in a worse case than of before: by God's passion! that were to cut my own throat; and for a duchy or an earldom to yourself, you or such as you would cause some of your desperate knaves kill me. No, by God! he shall never be in that place.' I answered, 'He craves nothing of your majesty, but only of his mother.' The Earl of Leicester answered, 'That were to make him party to the queen my mistress.' I said, 'He will be far more party if he be in her place through her death.' She would stay no longer, but said she would not have a worse in his mother's place, and said, 'Tell your king what good I have done for him in holding the crown on his head since he was born; and that I mind to keep the league that now stands between us, and if he break, it shall be a double fault;' and with this minded to have bidden us farewell, but we achieved [*i. e.*, finished arguing upon this point]. And I spake, craving of her that her life may be spared for fifteen days;

she refused. Sir Robert craved for only eight days ; she said, ' Not for an hour ; ' and so gied her away."¹

The long succession of public and secret events which led to the bloody end, when laid open in full before us, reveal in their larger features two women engaged in a struggle in which one or the other must fall. They were driven to this by a destiny not entirely the making of either. Had Elizabeth sent the fugitive back to her own country, it would have been sending her to the scaffold. Had Queen Mary abandoned the world and its politics, the opportunity might have been given for her abiding in England in a retirement becoming a fallen monarch. From the moment, however, when she set foot on English soil, she was so beset by dreams of superseding her rival, that she could not conceal them from those around. She never ratified the treaty which withdrew her claim on the crown of England. With that claim she bargained among foreign potentates, like a spendthrift trying to raise money on his prospects of succession, and finally she left it as a legacy to Philip of Spain. If she was not guilty of any share in the conspiracies of Babington and others, no one was ever the victim of such unfortunate conjunctions of circumstances. It was hard, no doubt, but so it was, that one or the other must die. Pressure from without made it impossible that they should spare each other. To Queen Elizabeth the appeals were not only for her own life, but the throne of her ancestors, the freedom of England, and the safety of the Protestant Church. A beautiful queen, a captive and a victim to a cruel rival, was the cynosure of all chivalry, for whom there would be endless conspiracies. Her cause, too, was that of the holy Church which had adopted her, and passed the injunction that she must be counted innocent. That she should die seemed the hard doom of fate, as in some Greek tragedy

¹ Principal Robertson's History, Appendix, l. The editor of the ' Letters and Papers relating to Patrick, Master of Gray,' conscious that there was a laxity in the rendering of such documents in Principal Robertson's day, wished to print this remarkable paper from the original in the Warrender Collection, but found that it had been lost.

when a sacrifice must be made to appease the angry gods and save a people from ruin.

In the manner in which each acted her part before the world there was a powerful contrast. For the clumsy, cunning, and brazen mendacity with which her triumphant rival concluded the scene, no one has any palliation. Apart from all higher questions of truth and honesty, it was an outrage on good taste, and also on good sense, for it was unsuccessful. The practical appeal of "thou canst not say I did it" was made in vain, and even the persecution of poor Secretary Davison was wasted. One ray of goodness is there in the whole dark scene, but it is one that does not brighten up the chief actress. The courtiers came through a sore trial without substantial reproach. One then living made a monarch say, "It is the curse of kings to be attended by slaves who take their humours for a warrant to break into the bloody house of life." If this was a general truth of the period, Elizabeth did not find such slaves; and her unfruitful hints—hints which approach solicitation—are creditable to the honourable feeling of those about her.

There exists as one of the foulest blots on English history, that terrible letter by Walsingham and Davison to Paulet and Drury—a letter believed in by successive authors, from Sir Harris Nicolas, who gave it publicity, to the latest historian of the period. It tells how, from remarks recently made by her majesty, "she doth note in you both a lack of that care and zeal for her service that she looketh for at your hands, in that you have not in all this time—of yourselves without other provocation—found out some way of shortening the life of the Scots queen, considering the great peril she is hourly subject to so long as the said queen shall live;"—they knew how unwilling their mistress was to shed blood, and "had shown a lack of love towards her of strange sort, seeing what ground they had for the satisfaction of their consciences towards God."

Sir Amyas Paulet was a surly jailer. He acted somewhat the part of enemy to his captive, whether because he really recoiled from her as a criminal, or desired to fortify

himself against her witcheries. But neither he nor Drury chose to undertake the work thus marked out to them. For the reputation of Walsingham and Davison, too, there is the partial refuge that they were the mere channels communicating their mistress's desire—a desire they were themselves incapable of perpetrating. But if these are withdrawn from the guilty circle, what is to be said for the illustrious queen left there alone?¹

As for the victim, no martyr conscious of a life of unsullied purity ever met her fate with greater dignity. The Church she belonged to was one that could undertake to clear off a balance of crime. She did her expiation with a noble simplicity. For many years she had submitted quietly to restraints and humiliations, rather as one who was in that shape raising herself above her persecutor, than from weakness or servility.

She was through all her later years the placid, dutiful child of the Church. If she conspired, it was because the Church called on her to mix her destinies with its glorious triumph over heresy and schism. Ardent devotee as she was, however, of the old Church, we do not find

¹ There is a letter from Queen Elizabeth herself to Paulet susceptible of an ominous meaning. It has been repeatedly printed, and appears to have been collated with the original by Froude (xii. 260): "Amyas, my most faithful and careful servant, God reward thee treblefold for thy most troublesome charge so well discharged. If you knew, my Amyas, how kindly, besides dutifully, my grateful heart accepteth and praiseth your spotless actions, your wise orders, and safe regards, performed in so dangerous and crafty a charge, it would ease your travails and rejoice your heart. In which I charge you, carry this most just thought, that I cannot balance in any weight of my judgment the value that I prize you at, and suppose no treasure to contravail such a faith; and shall condemn myself in that fault which yet I never committed if I reward not such deserts. Yea, let me lack when I most need if I acknowledge not such a merit with a reward."

Expressions so much at variance with their author's usual style of composition are apt to recall to the students of Shakespeare how King John hinted his desires about Prince Arthur:—

"Come hither, Hubert. O my gentle Hubert,
We owe thee much: within this wall of flesh
There is a soul counts thee her creditor,
And with advantage means to pay thy love."

that individual priests had much influence over her. Her intercourse with her favourite the Bishop of Ross was of a purely secular kind, and the two understood each other in matters of this world. We hear nothing except officially of her confessor, or of her seeking the confessional.¹ Denying to her the services of a priest commissioned to afford her the consolations of her own religion, and endeavouring to obtrude on her the abominated services of a heretic, will remain in history as one of the minor cruelties committed under the influence of religious zeal. But perhaps the infliction was not so keen as some suppose. She had done her expiation, and the Church would see that it was effectual. That Church had in its plenary powers means for rectifying errors. If, as it is asserted, she had in her possession the element for the viaticum specially consecrated by the Pope, she had a plenary protection against all that the malice of her enemies could effect by the denial of a living confessor.²

When the "mistake" so much deplored by Queen Elizabeth had been committed, she did her best to show the honours of royalty to the anointed queen who could

¹ In the "Estat de gages" referred in chapter xlvii., the State of the salaries on Queen Mary's French dowry, we have an allowance of 500 livres to Messire Roch Mammerot, docteur en théologie, as "confesseur."—Teulet (4th ed.), ii. 125.

² Curiosity has sometimes been felt about the reason why Queen Mary has not been canonised. But it is not yet too late, and a whisper has been recently abroad warning the world not to be surprised by such an event. It could only, however, I apprehend, be received as a natural event, and that for two reasons: First, that it would be an appropriate addition to the peculiar triumphs of the Pontificate of Pius the Ninth; second, that it would be but a logical conclusion of the dealing of her Church to herself while she lived, and to her reputation after death. It is there a creed loudly proclaimed that she is innocent of all the misdeeds imputed to her. But innocence in her instance is not merely a passive quality. It brings into active life all that she did and suffered—the calumnies and insults heaped on her—the long bondage—the final martyrdom; and all for her Church. If that Church withholds the due reward of such claims, it leaves a suspicion that it is conscious of something inconsistent with the loudly-proclaimed innocence. If the debt is yet to be paid, there would be much curiosity—not, of course, to be gratified—as to the case to be pleaded on the occasion by the *Advocatus Diaboli*.

no longer trouble her. The pageant of a magnificent funeral was performed, and its performance was duly reported as a State ceremony. We are told that the body was conveyed on Sunday the 30th of July from Fotheringhay to the Cathedral Church of Peterborough by Garter King-at-arms and four heralds, attended by forty horsemen, "having for that purpose brought a royal coach drawn by four horses, and covered with black velvet richly set forth with escutcheons of the arms of Scotland, and little pennons round about it." We are told how, "the body, being enclosed in lead and the same confined in wood, was brought down and reverently put into the coach, at which time the heralds put on their coats of arms, and bare-headed, with torches lighted, brought the same furth of the castle."¹ The Countess of Bedford led the ceremonials at the cathedral as chief mourner, where, in the presence-chamber, hung with black cloth, "she was by the queen's majesty's gentlemen ushers placed somewhat under a cloth of estate of purple velvet, where having given to the great officers their staves of office—viz., to the lord steward, lord chamberlain, the treasurer and comptroller—she took her way into the great hall where the corpse stood." Then there is the marshalling of a procession, beginning, "two conductors in black, with black staves; poor women mourners to the number of a hundred, two and two; the standard of Scotland, borne by Sir George Saville, knight." She was laid in a vault beside the tomb of Catherine of Aragon, the repudiated wife of King Henry.²

It has been so often repeated in history as to be taken generally for granted, that the execution of Queen Mary excited universal indignation throughout Scotland. There is no evidence for this, nor is there any for another often-repeated assertion which naturally leads to it as cause to effect—the assertion that there had been during Queen Mary's ill-usage a general reaction in her favour. Whatever change of sentiment there may have been was un-

¹ "A Remembrance of the Order and Manner of the Burial of Mary Queen of Scots;" *Archæologia*, i. 155.

² *Ibid.*

doubtedly in the other direction. Only in the strange escapade of Grange and Lethington was there any indication that those who were against her when she signed her abdication had gone over to her side. Her partisans, a feeble minority, had been dropping into the grave, and their cause was not of the kind that gains recruits. No doubt, of her old, faithful, and assured partisans, many there were to whom her death was an event full of bitterness and grief. But for the bulk of the nation to demand that she should be succoured, or, when that had become impossible, avenged, would have been to quarrel with Elizabeth for doing in her own quarrel what they would have done in theirs had the opportunity fallen to them.

Indifference to her fate, if it might not even be called approval, was shown by one portion of the community in a shape that seemed indecorous and ungenerous. Those concerned give this version of the affair: "The king commanded the ministers to pray publicly in the kirks after sermon for his mother. They refused to do it in the manner he would have it to be done—that is, by condemning directly or indirectly the proceedings of the Queen of England and their Estates against her, or as for one innocent of the crime laid to her charge."¹ No doubt they could plead the stern rules of their Church against the commands of man; but had their hearts been with the victim, they would have found a method of so expressing themselves. Their zeal showed itself entirely in the other direction. The king arranged that Archbishop Adamson should fill the pulpit of St Giles's Church to perform the desired devotions. When the king himself went to attend on the service, he found that his opponents had been too nimble for him, and had placed Mr John Cowper, a stern member of their own order, in the place of ministerial power. The king ordered him to descend and give place to the bishop. "Mr John gave place, but uttered his discontent in these words, 'That he would make an accompt one day to the great Judge of the world for such dealing.'" This act, indeed, in the eyes of Mr

¹ Calderwood, iv. 606.

John's party, was a far more serious outrage than the death of the modern Jezebel. The king afterwards made a floundering apology for the act: "That he was sorry for that which had fallen some few days before touching the discharge of their preacher, protesting he did it of no evil mind, and that he would always favour the ministry and the religion presently professed. He said he was of that mind that none of his subjects would blame him for his affection which he carried to his mother, which moved him to do that which he did. But the charge he had given to the ministers was to pray to God not only to enlighten her with the knowledge of the truth, but also that the sentence pronounced against her might not take place. Always the people were satisfied with this excuse."¹

Some members of the Estates held a meeting to encourage and instruct the ambassadors sent to intercede with the Queen of England; but it was not counted a Parliament, and there is no reference to their proceedings in the public Acts of the day. This was the only public movement in her favour; and after the tragedy was completed, it may be said that the only vengeance taken for it was against the Master of Gray, who was said to have been punished on certain ostensible charges, because he was secretly believed to have furthered instead of endeavouring to stay her execution. The Borderers, expecting a possible dispute between the two countries, were on the alert to catch any opportunity for pursuing their old trade; and as they had collected in bodies here and there, they did not separate without mischief. They had now been for some years restrained, but still ever on the alert to catch the faintest symptom of the blessing of war. On this, as on other occasions, they were doomed to disappointment.

Such were all the political portents that in the poor victim's own country attended a tragedy that was to appal the civilised world in its own day, and live in perpetual memory in literature.² The one event in which her con-

¹ Calderwood, iv. 606, 607.

² Among the manuscripts in the Rolls House there is an account

duct in some measure influenced her own country, because the one which involved England in the greatest peril, did not happen until after her death—it was the Spanish Armada. The faith, bigotry, or by whatever other name we call that prevailing mental phenomenon for which Philip of Spain was conspicuous, told him, as an absolute destiny for the world, that the true Church was to prevail, and destroy the enemies which by the divine will had been permitted for a time to rebel against it. It was his ambition to be the earthly leader in that divine retribution. It was not, however, in his nature to be active. Perhaps he thought events would be ruled into a concurrence which would tell him when to come forth, and he would then decide all with an overwhelming power that would extin-

of a scene leaving no trace in the known Parliamentary records, and so totally out of harmony with all other testimonies as to the prevailing tone in Scotland as to this juncture, that I can only copy it from the original without comment. It is in a letter addressed to Walsingham by Robert Carvell or Carell, called in Thomas's 'Historical Notes' a "captain at Berwick." It is dated on 3d August 1587, and the scene it describes is referred to as occurring at a meeting of the Estates on the 26th of July: "The Lord Chancellor made ane oration in the presence of the king and his nobilitie touchinge a revenge for the death of the quene; and then and there all the lords (upon their knees) which weare there present made a solemne vow that they would always be readie to ayd and assist hym both with the hasard of lands, lives, and goods, whensoever his majestie shold command them in that action. But for maintenance of the Gospel and the mynestrý there is no provision made."

Sir James Melville, who continued to be as much attached to his patroness as he could be to any one no longer able to help him, gives a story nearly to the same effect: "Albeit his majesty when he understood of these sorrowful news, took heavy displeasure, and convened ane Parliament, where he lamented the mishandling of the queen his mother by his enemies that were in England, desiring the assistance of her subjects to seek to be revenged. When all the Estates in a voice cried out in a great rage to set forward, and promised that they should all hazard their lives and spend their goods and gear largely to that effect, and to get amends of that unkindly and unlawful murther. Whilk put the Council of England in great fear for a while; but some of her countrymen comforted them, and so did some English that haunted our Court, alleging that it would be soon forgot" (Memoirs, 356, 357). We can only infer from this that there was some excitement and indignation, but that it was neither deep nor durable.

guish strife, as a powerful monarch deals with his turbulent subjects. But now an impulse was given in an appeal to his chivalry.

Among the State secrets that had transpired, with that dubiety hanging about it which such secrets often retain, one was about a will by Queen Mary found among her papers at Chartley, with matter of so dangerous a kind in it that Queen Elizabeth burnt it with her own hand. It contained a bequest of her claim on the sovereignty of England and Scotland in favour of Philip II. of Spain, with a desire that he should come and take possession. Two of her servants, Elizabeth Curl and Jane Kennedy, said that she had commissioned them verbally to intimate this bequest to the King of Spain. The form in which he accepted of it was, that he was to press on his preparations for an invasion of England; and when he had succeeded in subduing the whole island, and bringing it under the spiritual authority of the Church, he was, if he should find King James still obstinate in his heresy, to take possession of the prize, and hold the British Isles as part of his own dominions.

When, eighteen months after the execution of Queen Mary, the Armada entered the Channel, all rumours about the advance of the mighty armament were anxiously listened to in Scotland. The interest there was such as all nations feel when a close neighbour is threatened with some convulsion or imminent peril.

There was a cordial understanding between the two Governments that they should make common cause, and all was ready in Scotland for summoning the feudal array. How far King James was influenced by hints or promises of the English succession, how far he was merely playing a part in professing to serve England and the Protestant cause, are questions that have given rise to much discussion and conjecture. They are, however, of secondary moment, since the occasion was one of those which in a constitutional country carry political points with a power stronger than that of the Court. There was, as we shall have occasion to see, a Papal power concentrated in the north, and ready to act if it could with any chance of

success ; but the national strength was on the other side, and was overwhelming. In one district only was there a distinct symptom of a rising against the popular side. The Lord Maxwell, for all that he had helped in the late revolution, was a loser by it, as the earldom of Morton, which he believed he had fairly won, fell to the heir of the regent by the revocation of the forfeiture of the family. Maxwell belonged to the old religion. It became perceptible that he was arming, and the king marched at the head of a force and seized him. His office of warden of the western marches was given to his feudal enemy the Laird of Johnston.

The Presbyterian clergy were in a state of intense activity, holding numerous meetings and passing resolutions. The band or covenant of 1581 was renewed and signed all over the land, receiving in many instances the names of unwilling subscribers. A survey or census was taken of the amount of Popery still in Scotland : it brought out alarming results in the north-eastern district under the influence of the Gordons. A general fast was appointed for the purpose of averting the sufferings and dangers of the land from the following causes : "The universal conspiracies of the enemies of the truth against Christ's Kirk, to put in execution the bloody determination of the Council of Trent. 2. The flocking home of Jesuits and Papists to subvert the Kirk within this country. 3. The defection of a great number from the truth. 4. The conspiracies intended against the same by great men, entertainers of Jesuits and Papists. 5. The coldness of professors. 6. The wreck of the patrimony of the Kirk, abundance of bloodshed, adulteries, incest, and all kinds of iniquity."¹

There was a fear that, although destined for England, the Spanish fleet might be compelled by the exigencies of navigation to discharge its living freight on some part of the coast of Scotland, where no effective resistance could be made to the force that might be thrown into the country. Such a fear was indeed in harmony with the character of the expedition, the nature of which was to

¹ Calderwood, iv. 676.

set in motion a vast power uncontrolled by the capacity to direct its blows against any particular point, if indeed it was to strike at all. The fervid exultation of England on the disasters which befell the expedition is natural ; but historical experience shows that the Armada had in its nature no secure material element of success. Invasions in which bodies of men had been landed, had only crossed narrow seas with oared galleys drawing a slight depth of water. These required no harbourage, but could be beached on the open shore.¹ The vast floating masses, too great to be handled by the seamanship of the day, were literally trusted to the caprices of the sea ; and it would seem as if the fanatical monarch had carried his fatalism to the last, as a grand test of the question whether or not he was the accepted regenerator of Christendom. He had created out of the riches of his country the material elements, and he trusted to the Power that is above all to direct them to a successful issue.

There were others equally prepared to see the guiding finger of the Deity expressly directing the destiny of the expedition, and these had the justification of success to support them. They had the satisfaction to behold fragments of the great vessels scattered here and there on the coast of Scotland, and as far north as the Orkney Islands. James Melville gives a lively account of an incident in these disasters which happened at his own door. He refers to the tremors and apprehensions of his friends, and then to their confidence after prayer and conference—a confidence well justified : “ And in very deed, as we knew certainly soon after, the Lord of Armies, who rides upon the wings of the winds—the keeper of His own Israel—was in the mean time conveying that monstrous navy

¹ Napoleon, when he threatened England in 1803, imitated this old and almost forgotten method ; and his doing so is the strongest evidence that he was serious. Had he brought his troops over in vessels, all the harbours of the English coast opposite to France would have been insufficient to accommodate them. He therefore built rafts with bulwarks, which were to be towed over and beached.

about our coasts, and directing their hulks and galiats to the islands, rocks, and sands, whereupon He had destinate their wrack and destruction. For within twa or three months thereafter, early in the morning, by break of day, ane of our baillies came to my bedside, saying, but not with affray, 'I have to tell you news, sir. There is arrived within our harbour this morning ane ship full of Spaniards, but not to give mercy but to ask.'" The commander was allowed to land and make his explanations, but the men were required to remain on board until persons in authority could be consulted on an event of so unusual a kind in the burgh of Anstruther.

Meanwhile Melville continues: "Up I got with diligence, and assembling the honest men of the town, came to the tolbooth; and after consultation taken to hear them, and what answer to make, there presents us a very reverend man of big stature, and grave and stout countenance, grey bearded and very humble like, after meikle and very low courtesy, bowing down with his face near the ground and touching my shoe with his hand, began his harangue in the Spanish tongue, whereof I understood the substance; and being about to answer in Latin, he having only a young man with him to be his interpreter, [the young man] began and told it over again in good English." He was Jan Gomez de Medina, general of twenty hulks, and his ship had been wrecked on the Fair Isle, between the Orkney Isles and the mainland, where, after great hardships, they got a vessel to carry them along the coast. The old sea-captain, in telling the object of the expedition, said nothing about religion, but referred all to the exasperating piracies of the English. In this, whether he knew it or not, he touched a sympathetic chord; for the seaports of Scotland, and especially of Fifeshire, had bitterly complained of the same evil, and at that time the Court of England was adjusting the amount of compensation to the sufferers. Melville was kind to the stranger, but not without some boastfulness about returning good for evil. He assured him, that "whereas our people, resorting among them in peaceable and lawful affairs of merchandise, were violently taken

and cast in prison, their goods and gear confiscated, and their bodies committed to the cruel flaming fire for the cause of religion, they should find nothing among us but Christian pity and works of mercy and alms, leaving to God to work in their hearts concerning religion as it pleased Him."

The conclusion of this little incident is beautified by fine touches of tenderness and good feeling. The Spaniard was yet ignorant that the calamity went beyond his own ship, until one day when Melville brought him a news-sheet from St Andrews, "with the names of the principal men, and how they were used in Ireland and our Highlands, in Wales and other parts of England; the whilk when I recorded to Jan Gomez by particular and special names—oh then he cried out for grief, bursted and grat. This Jan Gomez showed great kindness to a ship of our town whilk he found arrested at Calais at his home-coming, rade to Court for her, and made great ruse of Scotland to his king; took the honest men to his house, and inquired for the Laird of Anstruther, for the minister and his host, and sent home many commendations. But we thanked God in our hearts that we had seen them among us in that form."¹

After completing this local sketch, the next entries that the Fifeshire clergyman has to make in his Diary spread farther afield, but connect themselves with the wreck of the Armada, as marching on to the fulfilment of the world's destiny in the destruction of Antichrist and the triumph of the true Church:—

"That 88 year was also most notable for the death of the Queen-mother of France, Catherine de Medicis—bloody Jezebel to the saints of God, who then was called to her recompense. As also the maist remarkable wark of God's justice in repaying the twa chief executors of that horrible carnage and massacre of Paris, making first King Henry to cause his guard stick the Duke of Guise under trust, with the Cardinal of Lorain; and syne a Jacobin friar—of that order whilk the king did maist for—maist

¹ Diary, 261-264.

treasonably to stick the king : the Lord working by maist wicked instruments maist wisely and justly." ¹

With such events to ponder over and bring home to their own conduct and destiny, it is not wonderful that the Melville party in Scotland should deem themselves the chosen instruments, who were to be swept forward on the wings of success to their ultimate triumph.

While news of events so astounding came one after the other from without, the inward life of the country was of a character unusually placid. King James reached his full age of twenty-one on the 19th of June—a little more than four months after his mother's execution. He made preparation for this auspicious event by a very innocent and picturesque experiment in his favourite science of kingcraft. The various feudal houses in Scotland were involved in a maze of quarrels, some political, others religious ; but the bitterest and least curable were the family feuds that had come down from generation to generation. The young king resolved with one happy wave of his enchanter's wand to put an end to all this strife, and inaugurate the reign of peace on earth. All were entertained together at a banquet in Holyrood House. They were then coupled two and two by the test of their hatreds, so that each might hold his chief enemy by the hand ; and thus they marched along the High Street, the king at their head, "in form of a procession, in their doublets, to the market-cross of Edinburgh ; where all men not only rejoiced to see and behald such apparent concord, but also praised the king of his great industry and travail. Thereafter his majesty and they went hame in that same order, saluted by a number of gunshot from the Castle of Edinburgh for joy. The people sang for mirth, and a great number of musical instruments were employed for the like use." ²

By an old rule of the civil law, the inheritor of private property, on reaching majority, had a period of four years within which he was privileged to challenge an alienation of his estate, or any other transaction by which he could

¹ Diary, 264.

² Historie of King James the Sext, 229.

show that he was a loser. Already there had been precedents for the sovereign applying the rule to grants injurious to the Crown. In July 1587 the Estates passed an Act called "The King's Majesty's General Revocation." In its terms it was a very comprehensive revocation of all grants to the prejudice of the Crown, made either by the king's "umwhile dearest mother" before his coronation, or by himself in his minority, excepting those confirmed by Act of Parliament. This Act was of less note and importance in itself than as a precedent for a similar revocation by Charles I., which was far more emphatic, both because it followed on the profuse and lax practice of King James's reign, and because it was enforced by a sterner hand. It is observable that the term "teinds," or tithes, which was the most critical article in the subsequent revocation, does not occur in that of 1587."¹

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 439.

CHAPTER LX.

TO THE REACTION OF EPISCOPACY.

THE KING'S MARRIAGE PROJECTS—ANNE OF DENMARK—KING JAMES'S ONE ROMANCE—HIS VOYAGE TO SCANDINAVIA TO BRING HOME HIS WIFE—THEIR RETURN AND RECEPTION—FORMAL ADOPTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN POLITY—THE NEW BLOOD THROWN INTO THE PRESBYTERIAN PARTY—ANDREW MELVILLE—STORY OF STEWART, EARL OF BOTHWELL—HIS ESCAPADES—THE ADHERENTS OF THE OLD CHURCH—HUNTLY AND THE NORTHERN ROMANISTS—THE MYSTERY OF THE SPANISH BLANKS—THE BATTLE OF GLENLIVET—THE POPISH EARLS—THE CEREMONIAL OF THEIR REPENTANCE AND RECONCILIATION TO THE CHURCH—THE TRIUMPHS OF THE MELVILLE PARTY—THE CONTEST WITH THE COURT—THE SCENE IN EDINBURGH—FLIGHT AND RETURN OF THE COURT—REACTION.

DURING the transactions just related, the king's thoughts had been turning towards marriage. According to Sir James Melville, "his majesty determined first to seek counsel of God by his earnest prayer to address him when it would be metest, and the well of himself and his country. So that after fifteen days' advisement and devout prayer, as said is, he called his Council together in his cabinet, and told them how that he had been advising and praying unto God the space of fifteen days to move his heart the way that was metest, and that he was resolved to marry in Denmark."¹ Frederick II., King of Denmark, had two daughters. The elder was married to the Duke of Brunswick, while yet the proffers from Scotland had not taken distinct shape; but there remained

¹ Memoirs, 365.

the younger, Anne, born in 1574. As a point of prudence, Queen Elizabeth was consulted on the project, but with no good result. On all questions about the marriage of the Scots king she had shown as much feminine wilfulness and caprice as if she had been a giddy girl plotting a match for herself. She had set Bowes on the watch for any project to wed him to a daughter of the house of Guise ; and though she spoke of the sister of the King of Navarre, who was about to become King of France, it may be questioned if any alliance would, when it came to practical arrangements, have met her approval. The marriage of any person of the male sex in whom she took an interest always disturbed her nerves and temper. To the Danish alliance she expressed herself so hostile that the wildest projects for defeating it were imputed to her. She induced Maitland the chancellor and some other men of influence to oppose the union ; but James was wilful about it as a matter personal to himself, and would not be controlled.

This project of a marriage with a princess of Denmark calls us back on an affair of a few years earlier having so little influence on events at the time of its occurrence, that to have stopped to mention it would have disturbed the sequence of those that completed the rise and fall of Arran. A solemn embassy from Denmark arrived in Scotland in the year 1585. This was one of the events that disturbed Queen Elizabeth's equanimity. Sir James Melville says she heard of it while yet only in project, and says "whether she suspected or had heard that it was to draw on a marriage" he could not tell, but it might at least create "a greater familiarity and friendship" between the two powers ; and her dislike of such a prospect was one of the reasons for the embassy of Wotton.¹ According to Melville, between the machinations of Wotton and Arran, the ambassadors were treated with sullen rudeness both by the king and his Court. It might partly help to this, that it was their duty to touch on the unpleasant topic of the claims on Orkney and Shetland. At the same time, Melville,

¹ *Memoirs*, 336.

who is the teller of the affair, having to explain his own services in obtaining attention and courtesy for the ambassadors, perhaps exaggerated the errors he was enabled to correct. He describes how the young king was stirred to speak of the ambassadors as the boorish representatives of a remote and powerless Court, with no diplomatic place among the established sovereignties of Europe, and how Wotton retailed to them what he said, and told them how far different was the account made of King Frederick by his own powerful sovereign. Whatever truth might be in this, there was wisdom in the words of Melville when he represented the Danish monarchy as waxing to great power, and likely to become the formidable rival of England in the northern seas; and how Queen Elizabeth in her prudence "made mikle accompt of the king and country of Denmark, and durst not offend him nor none of his ships, both by reason of the strait passage at Elsinore; and also he had great ships to take amends, in case she did him or any of his wrong."¹ Melville escorted them to their vessels, in good humour and endowed with gifts;² and as they stepped on board they said it had not been among their instructions to speak of matrimony, yet had their king certain fair daughters open to royal suitors, and if it happened to his master to be one of them, the affair of the Orkneys might be put right.³

When it was at last resolved, ten years after their departure, to send an embassy to Denmark, there seem to have been many difficulties in finding a person of suitable dignity to act as its head. Melville gives an account of them, amusing but rather prolix, since he was himself personally solicited to undertake the duty, and was determined to escape from it if he could. He held that if he

¹ *Memoirs*, 312.

² The presents were characteristic of King James. They were three substantial gold chains made from one of great length, "borrowed" by him for the purpose from Arran, who was not in a position to refuse anything, for "gin he had refused he would have tint the king, and in delivering of it he should tyne the chain."—*Ibid.*, 345.

³ *Ibid.*, 346.

must go, he would require legal assistance, especially to manage the nice question about the claims on the property of the Orkney and Shetland Isles. He suggested the choice of Sir John Skene, a great practical lawyer and scholar, because "he was best acquainted with the conditions of the Germans, and could make them lang harangues in Latin, and was a good, true, stout man, like a Dutchman."¹

In the end the mission was confided to the Earl Marischal, who with a proper train of attendants sailed for Copenhagen. The marriage by proxy was solemnised in August 1589.

A brilliant little fleet was equipped to carry the bride home, but it was so beat about by storms that it had to seek safety by running into a port in Norway.

James had one of those erratic wills on the motions of which no one could calculate, and he might be found doing something as far off from the character indicated by his common habits as he could go. He determined at this juncture to have one romance in his life—to sail to Norway, and to rescue his bride from the thralldom of the stormy sea. He left behind him an explanatory document, which is one of the oddest fruits of his eccentric brain.

He begins by assuring his people that he was endowed with all qualities for fulfilling the duties and enjoying the happiness of the marriage state: yet, but for a sense of public duty, he could have contented himself in solitude; for he says, "I am knaune, God be praised, not to be very intemperately rash nor concetty in my weightiest affairs, neither use I to be so carried away with passion as I refuse to hear reason." His object was to expedite the marriage. From a good deal of indistinct mumbling it is clear that he thought there were influences at work which would keep his bride out of his hands, if that could be done through delays and impediments. He finds a lack of assistance and zeal among his own advisers and servants, and so he will go himself, and go at once. It is exactly what the testy head of the household does when, from a

¹ Memoirs, 366.

dispute among the domestics or otherwise, the piece of menial duty that should be done is not done,—the lord takes the shovel or the frying-pan, or whatever may be the proper instrument, and does the thing with his own hands, as the heaviest of all rebukes to his undutiful domestics.

The chancellor had been the leader of the opposition to the marriage, and the king is exact and full in announcing that his voyage was kept an entire secret from that high officer for two reasons: "First, because I knew that if I had made him of the counsel thereof, he had been blamed for putting it in my head, whilk had not been his duty, for it becomes na subjects to give princes advice on such matters; and therefore, remembering what envious and unjust burden he daily bears for leading me by the nose, as it were, to all his appetites, as if I were an unreasonable creature, or a bairn that could do nothing of myself, I thought pity then to be the occasion of heaping so much unjust slander upon his head." The other reason for concealment was to prevent the chancellor from putting impediments in the way of his voyage, and so he sums up: "This far I speak for his part as well as my own honour's sake, that I be not unjustly slandered as an irresolute ass, wha can do nothing of himself; as also that the honesty and innocency of that man be not unjustly and untruly reproached."

On the 19th of November he joined his bride at Oslo or Opslo, an ancient town where New Christiania the capital of Norway now stands. We are told that "his majesty minded to give the queen a kiss, after the Scots fashion, at meeting, whilk she refused, as not being the form of her country. After a few words privily spoken betwixt his majesty and her, there passed familiarity and kisses." He had intended to return immediately, but was detained by the prospect of "raging seas and storms." We are told that "upon the 23d of November 1589, the king and queen were married in Opslo by Mr David Lyndsay, minister at Leith. The banquet was made after the best form they could for the time."

They then joined the Court at Copenhagen at the newly built Castle of Kronberg. The royal guest had an oppor-

tunity of seeing and partaking in much jollity. The English gentry of that day were hard drinkers. The Scots who could afford to do so probably drank still harder; but both beheld with admiring astonishment the feats of the Danish courtiers when there was an opportunity of mixing in their carouses. James was in some measure seasoned to such an ordeal, as he reveals when, in the announcement of a gift of the earldom of Murray to Alexander Lyndsay, he dates his letter "from the Castle of Kronberg, where we are drinking and driving our in the auld manner." They arrived in Scotland on the 1st of May 1590, and were received with much pageantry and public rejoicing.¹

We have seen one great subsidence in the influence of political disturbances in Scotland, and we are now in another. By the earlier subsidence, convulsions and revolutions in the government of Scotland ceased to have a material influence on the politics and prospects of other countries: that subsidence may be held to date at the capture of Edinburgh Castle, and the extinction of the prospect that Queen Mary could be restored. More than once, as we have seen within the few years since that

¹ For authorities on the king's marriage see 'Letters to King James the Sixth,' Maitland Club; and 'Documents relative to the Reception in Edinburgh of the Kings and Queens of Scotland.' See also the reference to Professor Schiern's Book at the end of chapter lii. The "Documents" do not give the names of the persons identified as sons of those who were called the witnesses of Bothwell's confession, but they show that the queen was attended by a train of her countrymen. "There came with the king and queen's majesty, the Admiral of Denmark, the Captain of Elsinburgh, with sundry others noblemen of the realm; and besides that 30 or 40 persons in golden cheynes of good fashion. The number of the haill train was 224 persons, whilk were all entertained by the king and noblemen of Scotland, and banqueted daily. There were 1200 merks every day for their furnishings during the time of their remaining.

"Upon the 19th day of May, the queen's grace made entry in Edinburgh at the west-port, and was receivet after a certain speech in Latin, and delivery of the keys, as use is, and was conveyed through the hail toun, under a paill, to HalYROOD-house. There was 42 young men all clad in white taffitie, and visors of black colour on their faces, like Moors, all full of gold cheynes, that dancit before her grace all the way."—Documents, &c., p. 46.

period, there had been violent revolutions, in which the command of the country changed hands, and was bandied, as it were, between parties utterly hostile to each other; but Scotland alone felt each convulsion, and it probably was hardly known beyond England.

The second subsidence now reached will be found accompanied by abundance of quarrelling, plotting, and change of fortune; but none of these violences and fluctuations were sufficient to create a political revolution in the Government; and thus in some measure they descend from the rank of State events, and partake of the nature of personal crimes and outrages, interesting only in the revelations they afford of the social condition of the country at the period.

The more important changes of the period were in the Church, and these were more nominal than real. The zealous Protestant party, as they had gained one accession of strength by the massacre of St Bartholomew, gained another in the attempt of Spain to invade Britain by the Armada. The pressure of the party on the Court now acquired much power, yet not enough to account for the concessions which they appear to have extracted. To the general reader of our histories it is sometimes perplexing to find it told, that in the year 1592 Episcopacy was abolished, and the Presbyterian system was legally established in Scotland. The event comes in an isolated shape, without sufficient preparation in a contest gained by the one party and lost by the other; while it is equally without result—the progress of events and the condition of the country showing no signs of so radical a religious revolution.

No doubt it was solemnly effected by an Act of Parliament; but the decision of the Scots Estates never had, like an English Act of Parliament, that absolute effect of a public law which can only be unmade as solemnly and deliberately as it has been made. It came to be the doctrine of the English lawyers, that an Act of Parliament, however old it might be, or however long its existence might be forgotten, must, if this existence could be proved, be put in force, whatever hardship and injustice its en-

forcement might occasion. In Scotland an Act might drop into oblivion, and in that state be virtually repealed ; and many of the Acts were, owing to sudden change of opinion or other causes, never considered as practical rules. The English Legislature, in consideration of the enduring and unliable character of its statutes, protracted their final adoption by many forms and reconsiderations. In Scotland, on the other hand, an Act of the Estates had in a great measure the character of a vote or resolution by a popular assembly, which might be forgotten when the feeling that had carried it was weakened. It requires us to consider this distinction to account for the slighness of the real change produced by the Act of 1592.

The substance of the Act is unequivocal and distinct, doing all that words could do to establish the Presbyterian polity. This is described as the jurisdiction and discipline "agreed upon by his majesty in conference had by his highness with certain of the ministry convened to that effect." The Act of 1584 authorising the Episcopal hierarchy is repealed, and the Church is to consist of a General Assembly, Provincial Assemblies or Synods, Presbyteries, and the Kirk-Sessions attached to individual spiritual charges. These were the elements of a Presbyterian or republican hierarchy, with a power of review by the higher over the lower judicatories, up to that body which is alike the supreme court and the supreme parliament of the spiritual Estate—the General Assembly. All collation to benefices is to be in the hands of this hierarchy. The power of the presbyteries, which were the most active of the grades, was especially "to give diligent labour in the bounds committed to their charge that the Kirk be kept in good order ; to inquire diligently of naughty and ungodly persons, and to travail to bring them in the way again by admonition or threatening of God's judgments, or by correction." There was a condition in the Act against which, in the later times of its Presbyterian polity, the Church of Scotland sternly protested as savouring of Erastianism, or interference by the civil power in things spiritual. The king, or his commissioner, was to be present at the deliberations of the General Assembly ; and

he should, "before the dissolving thereof, nominate and appoint time and place when and where the next General Assembly shall be halden."¹

A short, but, if it were fully enforced, a powerful addition was made to the power of the Church by an Act passed in 1593 "for punishment of the contemners of the decreets and judicatories of the Kirk." It tells how "it is of verity that a number of obstinate and stubborn people in divers parishes of this land hath contemned and daily contemns the sentences and decrees of the said Assemblies and judicatories of the Kirk—namely, in landward parishes, where there is little or no concurrence of magistrates to punish obstinate and disobedient persons; and the said Kirk, having no other punishment in their hands but spiritual, the whilk the said obstinate people, being altogether fleshly and beastly, feels nor sets nought by;" therefore the judicatories so defied may apply to the Lords of Session or the Secret Council, who, if the offenders continue in their stubbornness, may issue against them the terrible writ of "horning," with all its ruinous consequences.²

How far this discipline might enter into affairs purely secular, there are instances all the more distinct that they refer to petty matters. Had the following occurrence in Morton's day been told by an opponent, it might be doubted; but it is given by the zealous Calderwood, under the head, "The regent opponeth to execution of discipline:" "About this time Robert Gourlay, an elder of the Kirk of Edinburgh, was ordained to make his public repentance in the Kirk of Edinburgh, upon Friday the 28th May, for transporting wheat out of the country. The regent being advertised, answered, when he was called on to utter his confession, and said openly to the minister, Mr John Lawson, 'I have given him licence, and it apertaineth not to you to judge of that matter.'"³

These Acts of the Estates were passed in the midst of a succession of personal disputes or altercations between the king and the more zealous of the clergy. Individually

¹ Act. Parl., iii. 541.

² Act. Parl., iv. 16.

³ Calderwood, iii. 328.

these bickerings are quaint and picturesque, but as they accumulate there is a uniformity in them that becomes tiresome. They were exasperated and embittered by the young king's self-conceit. There was not only his assertion of his supreme authority over all spiritual as well as secular matters, but he assumed, what is still more offensive to all clergymen, a superiority in the peculiar learning of their profession, and he would needs convince as well as control them. Thus attacked within their own ground, they used their theological weapons with little remorse, and did their best to inflict signal punishment on the intruder. They would have him submit to discipline too ; for, after all, a king was but a man subject to all human frailties, and the correction of these frailties was committed by the Deity to His Church.

Thus on one occasion, when he had failed in zeal for the promotion of the ends of the Church, although it was just after the passing of the Act professing to establish the Presbyterian polity, the Reverend Robert Bruce, with whom we shall meet hereafter, was appointed to deal with him. The scene is told by the historian of the Church under the heading of "The king's stubbornness under rebuke." He was at that time subject to a succession of tribulations from an eccentric and half-insane relation of his own, as we shall presently see. He had just escaped from one of these in which he thought himself in danger, and Bruce improved on the event, saying the king had received many admonitions, but this was sharper than the others. Then the rebuker "desired him to humble himself upon his knees, and confess his negligence before God, and to keep his promise better nor he did the last he made in that place. The king was so far from humbling himself upon his knees, that he stood to his own purgation, and controlled Mr Robert in some circumstances of the fact, which he related as he was informed, not having had as yet the full knowledge thereof."¹

This little scene connects itself with what we may call rather the adventures than the proceedings of one who

¹ Calderwood, iv. 168.

added a good deal of additional notoriety to the already notorious title of Earl of Bothwell. John Stewart, secular Prior of Coldingham, was one of the many illegitimate children of James V. He married Lady Jane Hepburn, a sister of the Bothwell who married the queen, and they had a son, Francis Stewart. He was a personal favourite of his cousin the king; and as the lordship of Bothwell was vacant, his connection with the former owners suggested that to confer it on him would be an appropriate mark of favour. He thus became Earl of Bothwell in 1587; and when King James went to Denmark, he and the Duke of Lennox were left in joint authority as his lieutenants.

When a man has found a place in history by his personal enterprise, we may almost always be sure to find a place for him also in the general political forces of the day. Either he works with a party in some grade high or low, or he has some great object towards which he directs the influence at his command. To this general rule Bothwell is a notable exception. There was no more policy in his violent and astounding enterprises, than in the mischievous frolics of the young men who in the present day wrench off knockers and upset policemen. Yet his career signally exemplified two political conditions peculiar to Scotland—the one, the utter feebleness of the Crown in itself; the other, the great and dangerous power that the monarch was able to confer on a favourite subject. Both arose out of that jealousy which denied to the Crown any armed force except that feudal array which subjects raised and commanded. No doubt Bothwell was so far attached to a party that he may be generally found in concert with the zealous party in the Church, but he was not a fitting coadjutor to them. In a layman co-operating with an ecclesiastical party there may not be much zeal, but decorum is indispensable to him. But Bothwell showed no sense of decorum either in his public acts or his private conduct.

His first personal quarrel with his royal patron is traced to some grotesque dealings with the witches, whose activity was excited by the sea-voyages to bring over the queen. It was charged that he made irreverent if not

dangerous inquiries of them touching the time of the king's death ; hence he was committed prisoner to Edinburgh Castle. He managed to escape. Believing, or professing to believe, that he owed his imprisonment to the enmity of Maitland the chancellor, he beset Holyrood House—or “made a stour” there, as one annalist says—and attempted to seize him ; but the attack was more terrible to the king himself than to the chancellor. As one who lived at the time sententiously says : “He and his accomplices came to the king's door, and the queen's, and the chancellor's ; at one time with fire to the king's door, with hammers to the queen's door. Sir James Sandilands was sent in haste to the Provost of Edinburgh. The citizens, warned by the sound of the common bell, followed the provost down to the palace. Before they came Bothwell and his accomplices escaped, all except seven or eight that were apprehended and after hanged at the cross.”¹ The king went to St Giles's to offer up public thanksgiving for his deliverance on this occasion ; but he offered it in a shape which somehow did not secure the approval of the leaders of the Church ; and John Craig took an opportunity to rebuke him from the pulpit, saying that, as a warning to him, “God in his providence had made a noise of crying and forehammers to come to his own doors.” The king, as usual, would make answer, “and endeavoured to stop the congregation from departing, and began to speak ; but Mr Craig, not hearing what the king said by reason of the throng, went his way.”²

In the same year, 1592, Bothwell assailed Falkland, where the king was. He was driven back, as it appears, not by any guard protecting the royal person, but by the timely assistance of the Fifeshire peasants in the neighbourhood of Falkland.³ Again, in July 1593, Holyrood Palace was surrounded by armed men, who found their way into its most private corners. They found the poor king in a condition as to clothing and otherwise which did not permit of distant flight ; and when he

¹ Calderwood, v. 140 ; Birrel's Diary ; Pitcairn, i. 357.

² Calderwood, v. 143.

³ Ibid., 168.

attempted to find safety close at hand in his wife's apartments, he discovered that his enemies had locked the door leading to them. "The king, seeing no other refuge, asked what they meant. Came they to seek his life? let them take it—they would not get his soul." But the marauder, kneeling, said he came to seek pardon for his former offences, and pardon was promised. Again the citizens came to the king's rescue in a tumultuous body, suddenly called by the common bell; but the king said he had come to terms with the assailant and needed not their aid.¹

Bothwell's last and most formidable raid on the royal household was in 1594, when he appeared suddenly at Leith with five hundred ruffians from the Border, threatening Edinburgh. The king had the Lord Hume at hand "with seven or eight scores of spears well appointed." Other courtiers had small parties of their retainers; but again the king had fallen into his enemy's hands but for the citizens of Edinburgh, who tumultuously assembled and marched out to attack Bothwell's party. These, finding that "the town of Edinburgh was coming forth," retreated along the east coast. "They rode thick and orderly, not moving themselves more than if none had come forth to pursue them. They rode by the back of Arthur Seat towards Dalkeith. The king rode through the Pleasance to the Burgh-mure, and the inhabitants of the town of Edinburgh with him on foot. Bothwell and his company were at the Woolmet when the Lord Hume and his company, and some of the guard charged upon them. Bothwell and his company turn and chase the Lord Hume and his company into the footmen. Sundry were taken and sundry hurt." The annalist remarks that "if the town of Edinburgh had not been upon the fields, Bothwell had chased the king and all his company in at the ports."² This was the last of his exploits; he retired to the Border, and wandered through England to the Continent, living, as it was said, a very vicious and

¹ Calderwood, v. 257; Camden in Kennet, ii. 572.

² Calderwood, v. 296, 297.

certainly an obscure life. If we are to believe a royal proclamation, his intention in this last attack was, "immediately after his majesty's apprehension, to have carried him captive to the Castle of Blackness—the keeper whereof being corrupt is now execute for his demerits—there to have detained his highness till his disordered outlaws had come from the Borders, who were indeed under warning to have met the fifteenth of this instant at Jedburgh."¹

The king was not at that time on the best of terms with the zealous party in the Church, whose power was concentrated in Edinburgh. To conciliate them, apparently, he sent to the presbytery of Edinburgh, soliciting them to give light for his guidance in this trying affair. "They, taking this motion to be a snare, answered they would pray for him, and against all that would oppose to the good cause." When he pressed them farther, "their advice was that he would turn and repent him of his sins."²

This succession of outrages and alarms gives a lively idea of a signally feeble and unprotected Court. Even some efforts made to guard the royal residence harmonise with the picture in their smallness and inefficiency. We have seen that during the custody of the king by the Ruthven lords there were insuperable difficulties in placing a guard of two hundred men round him. In 1584 a permanent guard of forty gentlemen, "honest and well horsed," were appointed to be in perpetual attendance on the royal person; but this novel force could only be established by Act of Parliament, so jealous were the Estates of anything that seemed to plant the seeds of a standing army."³

It goes somewhat in explanation of Bothwell's grotesque career, that he appears to have been on the whole a genial and likeable madcap. The king, though the personal sufferer from his pranks, could speak of him in a kindly

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, i. 341.

² Calderwood, v. 298.

³ "Ane Act touching the provision to his highness of a guard, and sure payment of their ordinarie wages;" Act. Parl., iii. 298.

spirit, and spared him when others urged severity. He seems, too, to have secured his followers in mischief by the popularity of his character; for the king, in the proclamation already cited, refers, as the cause of all, to the ignorant and foolish affection of his lieges borne to the said Bothwell, "which made him bold every three months to make a new conspiracy."¹

The eccentricities of this new disturber of the political elements seem to have been so far beyond the philosophy of the English emissaries that no story was too absurd to them. John Carey, Hunsdon's son, supplies Cecil with the following: "He trusteth so much upon the justness of his cause as he doth refuse to be tried by noblemen and his peers, and is contented to refer himself to the judgment of coblers, taylors, or suchlike artificers—whosoever it shall please the king or his adversaries to appoint for his trial. And doth further mean that against the day appointed he will return to Edinburgh, and there put himself into the hole among thieves and murtherers, to abide his trial till it be past; which being done, and he acquit of the fact, then is it thought that his enemies will fall, and that he shall be made lieutenant-general of the whole country."²

It was one of the difficulties in the case to find what religion he favoured. He had been under suspicion of Popery at the crisis of the Armada. In his later turbulence he had personated the vehement ally of the zealous Presbyterians. But again the clergy had a suspicion that his conduct rather helped the "Popish lords," to whose doings it is now time to attend.

When the younger Melville exulted over the calamities to the cause of Rome, which began with the destruction of the Armada, he had to say in sorrow, that "notwithstanding of the Lord's judgments that year upon Papists, yet, after the spirit of the serpent wherewith they are led, although cut and deadly wounded in divers parts, nevertheless they were ever stirring and menacing, so that divers

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, i. 341.

² Letters of John Colville, 98.

practicers and traffickers—Jesuits, seminary priests, and other enemies, of the Antichrist, crap in the country and kythed dangerous effects in divers parts—namely, in the north and south.”¹ On the western Border there were some adherents of the old Church supported by the power of the Maxwells; but however provoking their existence there might be, they could hardly be called dangerous. In the north-eastern districts, however, there was almost a Romanist principality, of which Huntly was the sovereign. There were repeated rumours that a Spanish force was to be landed there; and especially there was a fear that part of the Armada would be sent to give work there to the Government of Scotland, and cripple it for aiding England. Had such a landing been effected, perhaps a powerful body of auxiliaries would have joined them. Without foreign assistance, however—and the danger of such assistance seemed now over—Huntly’s power was not sufficient to give serious alarm in the south. At the same time it was too strong to be at once suppressed by the Government; and the Court and the Church both knew the unpleasing fact, that a part of the country was open for unmolested intercourse by sea with the Papal powers of the Continent.

There was a general impression that King James had dealings with Papal agents, and that he was ready to join the old Church if by doing so the turn of events should show that to be his way to the English throne. It was a matter on which he probably had no religious scruples; but he disliked in theory the ecclesiastical supremacy asserted by the Papal hierarchy, as he practically hated that spiritual independence and jurisdiction of the Presbyterians which was eternally thwarting him.² When we

¹ Diary, 265.

² There was much anxious discussion and many exaggerated rumours about the proffers made to Rome and Spain through secret agents accredited by James. Rumour seems to have exaggerated their offers, and these appear to have sometimes been made without authority. A set of papers relating to these emissaries is in the collection of the manuscripts of Sir James Balfour in the Advocates’ Library. Three persons come up in these and other authorities—a Jesuit named

look back to the political conditions of the day, we may pronounce that no wise man would have recommended King James to look in the direction of Popery as the path to the English crown. It is hard to say, however, what

Ogilvie, the same perhaps who was afterwards executed at Glasgow; Lord Semple, the head of a Romanist house; and his cousin, Colonel Semple. Lord Semple was in Spain, where he professed to be an ambassador. It appears, however, that he had no written commission of any kind; and in his native tongue, with something of a Spanish tinge in it, he thus writes to the king, showing the necessity of having one: "It will ples zour magestie, yat eftir my arriual hir I conferrit vith ye crunal, my cusing [the colonel, my cousin], for tryall of ye King of Spanis mening towartis zour magestis titill to ye crowne of Inoland, qua merualit not litill yat in so vechti a mater zour ma. nader gef me comisione nor varrand in na sort. Alwayis he has gotin satisfaxsiun to zour magesti, and yat sua sekretlie as na man hir knauis of it safen ane of ye Cunsall quha is his grit frind. Alwayis he hes desyrit me to del in yat mater yat his magesti vil be veri villing to enter of neu in lig vith zour ma., quhilk beand done, he nadir minis nor vill preguige zour ma. titill in one sort." He then urges the king to return a commission with the bearer as speedily as possible, and with all secrecy, as England is urging a peace with Spain—a measure not likely to be "to his majesty's contentment." He alludes to his cousin the colonel holding a permanent commission as his majesty's agent in Spain, and mentions that the English Jesuits are stirring up the Court to have no confidence in James, but to urge the claims of the King of Spain. He says: "I am assurit, gef zour ma. fallu [follow] out yis mater, zour ma. vil get assistense of ye King of Spane beth of muni and arims;" and thinks that "in ye mentyme it var not ill dune yat zour ma. schou zoursel f mair frindlie vith Ingland nor befor, quhairby thay tak ne suspisiune of zour ma." Among the papers there is an undated commission, which probably followed this appeal, a letter from James to the King of Spain, and instructions to Lord Semple in English, signed by the king. These documents contain nothing but congratulations to the new king, Philip III., on his accession, hopes that the old amity between the States may be renewed, and proposals for continuing commercial relations, with the exception of one clause in the commission which empowers the ambassador to treat "cætera prout ei a nobis in mandatis credita sunt." Semple in his next letter says that the receipt of the letter of credit made him an object of much distinction at the Spanish Court until it was translated and laid before the Council, when he found "ane dryar form of behavior." They complained that the ambassador had only a letter of recommendation in place of a letter of credit, and would not be content with his explanation that that form was adopted "for feir of interpretatioune." He mentions an interview with two members of the Privy Council, "quha demandit of me gif y^{or}. matie.

ideas may have been passed in review in his restless and rather incoherent mind, that he might examine and weigh them according to the canons of his beloved science of kingcraft. It is clear, too, that he loved to exhibit little feats in the practical application of this science, and to do acts and establish connections which set the world agazing, and acquired for him the repute of a politician so profound as to be inscrutable by ordinary intellects. It is probably due to something of this kind, rather than to any deliberate weighing of the question whether he should join the old Church, that we find the Solomon of his age coquetting with strange powers, and employing questionable agents. If it was so, he suffered the penalty frequently paid by mystifiers, and involved himself in an atmosphere of suspicion.

There is no doubt, too, that some of the suspicions about Popish tendencies arose out of his very natural desire to propitiate the powerful Romanist party still remaining in England, who could not look without fear to the prospect of dwelling under a monarch trained in the school of Melville and Row. In this view he might be complacent to Papists without any tendency to imbibe their religion; but he was among those who understood not such compromises, but held that whoever was not for them was against them. In 1589 Huntly and some of his coadjutors were indicted for a conspiracy to co-operate with the Armada. The indictment was of a general kind, asserting that Huntly had trafficked with foreign Papists, received Spanish gold, and levied men. There was much complicated procedure which led to nothing. The accused "came to the king's will," or put themselves in his hands; but punishment was not enforced. The king was strongly censured on the occasion, as perfidiously conniving at the enemy. It must be understood, however, in all the dealings with the Government at this time, that the punishment

wes Catholik, and gif y^{or}. m. wald assist ye King of Spaine againes his enemeis, he entering in lig w^t. y^{or}. mat^{ie}. I answers y^t. I douttit not bot gif his mat^{ie}. wald send ambassadors to y^{or}. mat^{ie}. y^{or}. mat^{ie}. suld gif him satisfacione in all thais maters according to reassone."

of such a man as Huntly was more than the administration of justice against an offender—it was the levying of war against a powerful enemy. Huntly indeed had so substantial a power at his command that he did not require to take refuge in the fortresses or mountain-recesses of his country as a refugee—he came southward, and “warded” himself in the Castle of Blackness, that he might meet in open court any accusation made against him. A peculiar feature of his trial was that the restless Bothwell stood with him at the bar as an accomplice, and came along with him to the king’s will, “for raising of men of war, convocating of our sovereign lord’s lieges—broken men, Borderers.”

Presently Huntly and he were to be in positions as antagonistic as the hunter and the hunted. After Bothwell’s raid on Holyrood House, Huntly was commissioned to pursue him and his accomplices under the writ bearing the appropriately savage title of “letters of fire and sword.” It was one of the economical devices of the time by which feudal power and enmity were made the means of executing penal justice. The writ gave authority for hostile attack, and for the destruction of strong places of retreat by fire.¹ Thus resistance was inferred, and the true spirit of the application of the authority was to put it into the hands of some one who was strong enough to execute it, and, as feudal enemy or otherwise, likely to take heartily to the task. Whether the Earl of Murray was named in the writ or not, Huntly chose to treat him as one of the accomplices or abettors of Bothwell. Murray was a handsome and very popular man, and was known in his day as “the bonny Earl of Murray.” It is generally said that Huntly desired to take vengeance on him for the evils the Regent Murray had done upon the house of Gordon; but it is as well to

¹ So recently as the year 1710 we find this practical definition of the writ: “Letters of fire and sword is when the Privy Council commissionates the sheriff, by all manner of force, to dispossess him who in spite of all law, after he is legally ejected, continues to possess.”—A Short Dictionary of the Select and Choicest Terms of the Scots Law.

remember that this Earl of Murray was not a son of the regent, but his son-in-law—the husband of one of his two daughters.

One night in February 1592, Huntly and his followers surrounded Murray's house or castle of Donibristle, on the north bank of the Firth of Forth. There was much confusion and ferocity, in which two conspicuous inhabitants of the house were slain—the bonny Earl, and Dunbar, the Sheriff of Moray. The occurrence was of a kind too common in that day. Perhaps it was technically defensible: it is said that Murray was hiding among the rocks when he was slain, and consequently might be held as endeavouring to escape from one entitled to use the sword for his capture. But it was quite sufficient to rouse excessive indignation in the Protestant community, when they remembered that within sight of Edinburgh the act was perpetrated by the great Papal potentate who held rule in the north, defying the laws for the establishment of the Protestant religion; and that the victim, himself a popular favourite, was connected with that venerated regent whose title he held. A zealous partisan says: "The king and the chancellor went from Edinburgh to Kinmel, to the Lord Hamilton, to eschew the obloquy and murmuring of the people. Hardly could they be assuaged. The provost and magistrates of Edinburgh with great difficulty stayed the crafts from taking arms to stay the king from riding and to threaten the chancellor."¹ The perplexed king had some unproductive communings with leading clergymen concerning this difficulty. He "sent for five or six of the ministers, made an harangue to them, wherein he did what he could to clear himself, and desired them to clear his part before the people. They desired him to clear himself by earnest pursuing of Huntly with fire and sword. A proclamation was made with beating of the drum to declare the king innocent, but no word of pursuing of Huntly. The king declared his part to be like David's when Abner was slain by Joab."² It was a rather felicitous parallel if he quoted David's con-

¹ Calderwood, v. 146.

² *Ibid.*, v. 145.

clusion: "I and my kingdom are guiltless before the Lord for ever from the blood of Abner the son of Ner."¹

Many wild conjectures were current to account for the deed itself, and for the impunity of the perpetrator. Among these it was said that the conduct of Queen Anne gave the king cause to be jealous of Murray; but there is nothing better than vague and hostile rumour to support any such charge against Anne of Denmark.

In the same year, 1592, occurred the incident called "the Spanish blanks," which disturbed the zealous Presbyterian party to an extent not easily realised by looking at the scanty materials by which it was produced. But in fact it was the mystery excited by imperfect evidence that created suspicion and terror. It was suspected that a man named Kerr, who was leaving Scotland by the west coast, had dangerous documents in his custody. The minister of Paisley, hearing of this, gathered some sturdy parishioners, who seized and searched Kerr. They took from him eight papers called "the blanks." Each had on it the concluding courtesies of a letter addressed to royalty, "De vostre majestie tres humble et tres obe-sant serviteur," and this was followed by one or more signatures. Otherwise these slips of paper had "no designation on the back, nor declaration of the causes for which they were sent, but blank and white paper on both the sides except the said subscriptions." Two of these were subscribed by the Earl of Huntly, two by the Earl of Errol, two by the Earl of Angus, and the remaining two by Huntly, Errol, and Patrick Gordon of Auchendoun.² Huntly, as we have seen, was the head of a sort of Popish principality in the north, and Gordon of Auchendoun was his nephew. Errol was his neighbour and coadjutor. The name of Angus was new to politics—he had only been a few months possessor of his title. Such efforts as availed to the chemistry of the age were made to reveal any writing with sympathetic ink above the subscriptions, but with no result.

After an inquisition, accompanied by torture, the con-

¹ 2 Samuel, iii. 28.

² Pitcairn, i. 320.

clusion arrived at was, that the blanks were to be filled up by William Crichton, a Jesuit, and James Tyrie, both notorious traffickers; and that when so filled up they were to contain an assurance that the powerful men who subscribed them "should raise a power of horsemen and meet the Spanish armies at their landing, and reciprocally to assist, accompany, and convoy them in their passing to England by all the forces they could procure upon the King of Spain's charges." Several letters of alarming import were found at the same time. They were written by the subscribers of the blanks and other people, and were addressed chiefly to the Duke of Parma. These documents have come to us in a manifesto or explanatory pamphlet, "printed and published at the special command of the king's majesty."¹ King James was at that time paying his addresses without much success to the zealous Presbyterians, and in the tone of these letters there is a suspicious tendency towards the revelation of terrible dangers escaped through the vigilance of the Government. The following passage, for instance, in a letter professing to come from an obscure and secret plotter to the Duke of Parma, is in a tone calculated to create a lively terror that beneath the surface of the political condition of the country there was a ramified mine of Popery and treason ready to be fired. After much else, it sets forth how the Deity had, "by the instant prayers and holy persuasions of two fathers, Jesuits, converted to our holy faith two heretic earls of the first authority and power amongst them—the one whereof is called the Earl of Errol, Constable of Scotland, converted by Father Edmond Hay; the other, called the Earl of Craufurd, converted by the said Father William Crichton. They are both able and wise young lords, and maist desirous to advance the Catholic faith and your enterprises in the isle, whilk they are deliberate to testify to his majesty Catholic and your

¹ 'A Discoverie of the unnaturall and traiterous Conspiracie of Scottisch Papistes against God, His Kirk, their Native Country, the Kingis Majesties Person and Estate,' &c.; reprint. Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, i. 317.

highness by their own letters, whilk by the grace of God I shall send by the first commodity. In the mean time they have required me to make you offer of their maist humble and maist affectionate service, promising to follow whatsoever the said Jesuits and I shall think good to be done for the conservation of the Catholics, and to dispose and facilitate the execution of your enterprises here—whilk they can do more easily nor they that are known to be Catholics, whose actions are ever suspicious to the heretics for their religion, whereof these two earls have not yet made outward profession.”

Such is a specimen of the secret and perilous correspondence with Spain which the Government professed to have discovered. But the measures adopted did not, in results at least, seem to balance the amount of dangerous treason so revealed. Orders were issued to the Popish lords to ward themselves. The king himself marched with a party to Aberdeen, and they fled northwards, leaving their strongholds at his mercy. There were many forfeitures; but they had yet to be ratified in Parliament to render them anything stronger than threats. The zealous Churchmen demanded the extirpation of Popery and Papists. On the other hand, the measures taken against the Popish lords were desultory and questionable: there was Parliamentary forfeiture, but it was not enforced; and Huntly returned to his strongholds, garrisoned them, and showed a formidable front.

We have seen that while Huntly ruled the Highland districts of the north bordering on his own large Lowland estates, Argyle was the Highland prince of the south-west. It was taken up as an ingenious policy which might clear away all difficulties, and cost the Government nothing, that the leader of the south-western Highlanders should be commissioned to attack his rival in the north. Accordingly Argyle appealed to the several chiefs under his influence, who, delighted with the task, brought their motley followings to his banner. They gathered like a snowball as they moved northwards, and in the end became, according to the estimate of the time, ten thousand strong—too strong, in the sense of counting strength by

numbers, for those who had to lead them. Argyle was a youth inexperienced in warfare ; but his great host would have obeyed no other commander, and possibly a smaller body might have served him better.

Distant as the chief territories of the Gordons were from Loch Fyne, and many and rugged as were the mountain-ranges between them, the Gordons could be easily approached from the west by a force accustomed to mountain war. When the Argyle men reached the higher feeders of the Spey, which they could probably reach undeterred by any enemy, their way was plain, and they had all along the upper ground. Their path was by the haughs or flat meadows along the Spey. Near Kinnussie they had to pass the fortress of Ruthven, but instead of besieging it, they scattered, and re-formed beyond it. On reaching the junction of the Avon with the Spey, they had still haugh-land to march upon. It was on the bank of a brook running into the Avon near the larger stream of the Livet that the Gordons were posted to give them battle. Huntly had only two thousand available men, but they had many advantages. They were trained to the discipline of the day, and they had six field-pieces—an arm which the Highlanders long after this period could never hear without panic. This small body belonged in a great measure to the district whence came the small force which had defeated Donald of the Isles at Harlaw in 1411. The armies met at a spot some thirty miles northward from the field of the older battle. The result was very similar, if we take the effect of the artillery as corresponding with the charges of the mounted men in mail. After repeated fierce attempts by the swarms of Highlanders to break in upon the compact array of the enemy, they were at last scattered with slaughter. They left one mark on the field,—Gordon of Auchendoun, the son, as it would appear, of the leader in the war of 1572, was among the few killed on his own side. This battle was fought on the 4th of October 1594. In its own neighbourhood it is called the battle of Altachoylachan ; but history has found for it a more easily pronounced and

remembered name in that of the district—the same Glenlivet which has another and more festive celebrity.

Nothing is better evidence of the fundamental weakness of a cause than an unproductive victory. This one was a gain to nobody but those who won it with their own hands. The little Romish party, strong in its native vigour, had no other support: it was utterly isolated. Henry IV. reigned in France with consolidated power, and Spain had been stricken with paralysis in the fate of the Armada. King James again marched northwards, taking with him Andrew Melville to be witness of his dealings with the followers of the Beast. There was no resistance, and he dealt as he thought fit with the strongholds of the Popish lords. But the extreme measure of transferring their forfeited estates to those who would hold them with a sure gripe was still delayed. Huntly and Errol, with some of their followers, went for a time abroad. We shall see that in the mean time James was hard pressed by the zealots on the opposite side; and it was a natural feeling in him and his advisers, that if these northern potentates would become reasonable and dutiful, they might be a stay and support against that body which was pressing its claims to an ecclesiastical independence that looked very like supremacy.

The end was that in the year 1597 the two earls, Huntly and Errol, announced that they had seen the error of their ways, and had been led to the adoption of the truth as set forth in the standards of the Protestant Church established in Scotland. Into the bosom of that Church they were received with solemnities and rejoicings. The place of this reception was the old church of St Nicholas, in Aberdeen. We have this account from an eyewitness of the scene there enacted on the 26th of June 1597:—

“The earls are set in the marriage-desk before the pulpit, with the king’s commissioner; the greatest part of the body of the kirk empty before the pulpit. Of noblemen, barons, gentlemen, and common people, such a confluence that the like was never seen in that kirk, in the body whereof the table for the communion was set and

covered. The bishop preached, and made a godly and excellent sermon. The sermon being concluded, the earls rise forth of their desk, come in before the pulpit, make an open confession of their defection and apostasy, affirm the religion presently confessed to be the only true religion, renounce all Papistry, &c. &c.; and of new swear never to decline again, but to defend the same to their life's end. The Earl of Huntly confessed his offence first to God, next to his majesty, to the Kirk and country, for the slaughter of the Earl of Murray; and so the bishop pronounces openly their sentence of absolution from the sentence of excommunication. The earls are then received by the whole ministry, being in number twelve or thirteen persons, who during all the time of the sermon sat at the table in the midst of the kirk, and with them the provost, bailies, and the most part of the council; and after the earls were received by the ministry, then Patrick Murray, commissioner for his majesty, received them in his highness' name."¹

The religious ceremony was followed by a secular rejoicing under the auspices of the corporation of Aberdeen, of which the conclusion is: "Wine drunken in abundance, glasses broken, surfitforfits casten abroad on the causeway, gather who may."² The material and substantial conclusion of these pageants, ecclesiastical and convivial, was, that the forfeiture of the two earls was revoked by the Estates at their meeting in November 1597.³

We must now go back, to attend to the movements of that larger body occupying a position in the Christian Church, theologically speaking, at its opposite extremity. But first it has to be told that there was some little diversion from the acrid disputes which occupied the country, in the rejoicings over the birth of a prince. He was born on the 19th of February 1594. He was the first-

¹ *Analecta Scotica*, 300.

² "Ceremonial of the receiving the Earls of Huntly and Errol to his majesty's peace at Aberdene, as contained in a letter from Mr T. Molissone to Mr R. Paip, 29 June 1597;" printed in Maidment's *Analecta Scotica*, i. 299.

³ Act. Parl., iv. 124.

boon of a family of children, to each of whom it was the destiny to hold a place in the gloomy chapters of after-history.

Any one who has attentively noticed the sequence of events in our History, and their relation to each other, cannot fail to observe with what power and distinctness the influence of what in physical science is called "action and reaction" has been exemplified in Scotland. We shall presently see another instance of this in the career of the triumphant party in the Church.

"The Kirk of Scotland," says her historian, "was now come to her perfection, and the greatest purity that ever she attained unto both in doctrine and discipline, so that her beauty was admirable to foreign Kirks. The assemblies of the saints were never so glorious nor profitable to every one of the true members thereof."¹

In the letter of the law they had gained everything. Their Presbyterian polity and discipline were established by Act of Parliament; their supremacy in things spiritual was admitted; the State became their servant, bound to enforce their decrees by denouncing their contumacious subjects as felons, and driving them beyond the pale and protection of the law. Lastly, the extent of their authority—the bounding line at which the spiritual ended and the secular began—was a matter for their own settling; at least they would certainly have allowed no other hand to draw such a line. It was not in human nature that they should not find occasion to try the practical strength of this nominal power.

They had in the mean time gained a personal triumph peculiarly sweet to the polemic soldier. Their great enemy Archbishop Adamson had fallen before them. They had convicted him of perpetrating Prelacy and other offences, and had excommunicated him. The excommunication was allowed to carry with it the civil penalty. He appealed pathetically to the king, striving to win both his theological and classical sympathy by translating the Lamentations of Jeremiah into Latin verse. But James

¹ Calderwood, v. 387.

had too much in common with those animals of the baser sort who drive the stricken brother from the herd ; and we learn that "the king was so vexed at complaints of Mr Patrick Adamson lying registered at the horn, and so ashamed of him, now infamous, that he cast him off, disposed his liferent to the Duke of Lennox."¹

We have seen what was the formidable consequence of being "at the horn." It gave the king the opportunity, which according to this account he took, of confiscating the revenue of the see. Adamson had a sore sickness, from which, according to the same authority, he got temporary relief by witchcraft, so that he preached a sermon before the king "inspired with another spirit than faithful ministers used to be." But again he fell under the hand of sickness ; and between this and abject poverty his miseries prompted him to seek aid of Andrew Melville, who within his own little circle was more powerful than any archbishop who had worn the mitre in Scotland. Speaking carnally, Melville was a generous man ; and we may count that he would remember, in the spirit rather of sympathy than of rivalry, that the fallen archbishop was, like himself, a scholar and a poet. But there was only one course open to him. The sinner who is to be accepted into the bosom of the faithful must recant and repent. Adamson in his wretchedness did so. Whether it was the fruit of true conviction, or caused by depressive hardship and shattered nerves, the recantation was the property of the Church, and they put it to all such profitable use to their cause as it would serve.

Before we see how the Church fared when in its exultation it grappled with a stronger opponent than the archbishop, it may be well to look at the condition of the Government with which it had to deal. The revenue of the country was in a wretched condition—the civil officers of the Government unpaid, and nothing available by which the Crown could in case of an emergency co-operate with the feudal force in the defence of the country. The source from which the treasury might be replenished was the for-

¹ Calderwood, v. 118.

feitures of estates. From the recent succession of convulsions and reactions, with their forfeitures and remissions, it may easily be inferred that the ownership of a large breadth of the landed property of the country was in a complicated and dubious state. To extricate it would require much hard work of a delicate kind. It would have to be considered whether a forfeiture should be carried to extremities, or the opportunity should be taken to get some cash in hand by remitting it for a fine. Estates absolutely forfeited would have to be turned into cash in the most profitable manner; and many cases of doubtful possession would have to be examined, with the frequent result that the doubtful title would be rendered a firm one for a money consideration. To do all this work a finance committee of eight men was appointed, who from their number were called "the king's Octavians." They were Alexander Seton, the Lord President; Lindsay of Balcarras; Walter Stewart, Secular Prior of Blantyre; John Skene, Lord Clerk Register—the great lawyer already referred to; Peter Young, also already mentioned as the king's tutor; Sir David Carnegie; Thomas Hamilton, the king's advocate; and James Elphinstone, one of the Lords of Session. The zealous party disliked them from the beginning, having grave doubts about the orthodoxy of some of them, and perhaps also because in their financial operations they failed to do what was desired of them for the patrimony of the Church:—

"At that time there were eight lords chosen, commonly called 'the king's Octavians,' all almost either being Papists or inclining thereto, who had the hail government of the estate and the king's living in their hands; but by their dealing the Kirk came no speed."¹ They had other enemies in the king's own household, or the personal attendants of the Court, whose interests suffered from anything partaking of financial inquiry and control. The battle of the octavians, with the zealots of the Church on one side and the "cubiculars" of the Court on the other, lasted for eighteen months, when the commission of finance,

¹ Row's History (Bannatyne), 40.

as the octavians may be called, resigned without leaving any strong mark of their hands on the condition of the country.

There had been for a year or two, and there continued, an acrid discussion between the zealots on the one side and the king and his advisers on the other. There was in it much of that peculiar rhetoric of which we have seen some specimens. To those who meet it for the first time it no doubt brings a sensation of the novel and the picturesque; but people who have had much communing with it are apt at last to find that it becomes tiresome, and cloyes on the mental stomach like other highly-flavoured meats. Giving no more of this than what is necessary, it may perhaps afford interest to see a specimen of clerical rhetoric of another kind and equally characteristic. It is the fruit of a kind of gregarious excitement whereto people of earnest convictions engaged in exciting discussions are liable, and it has the peculiarity that it deals more in self-penitence and reproach than in that condemnation of others which is the more frequent discourse of the same class. The phenomenon has appeared from time to time, and the later specimens of it have been usually termed Revivals.

It was appointed by the General Assembly that a day of humiliation and renewal of the Covenant should be held in each ecclesiastical district. In the presbytery of Fife the occasion was thus improved: "Mr David Black taught upon Thursday the 13th of May upon the 13th chapter of Ezekiel and the last verse of the 50th Psalm. He was copious, powerful, piercing, and pertinent. The brethren of the ministry and commissioners of every parish convened immediately after sermon, in place of the synod. The moderator, for better disposing of their hearts, handled the last chapter of Joshua very movingly, with great abundance of tears. The example and form of that chapter was followed point by point, first by commemoration of the benefits of God bestowed upon the Kirk of Scotland, in planting and guarding the same from the Castellans, Aubignists, Balaamitish bishops, and the late conspiracy of the Popish earls. Then he spake of their

unthankfulness and their undutifulness in their charges with such motion that all were forced to fall down before the Lord, with sobs and tears in abundance, every man mightily commoved, and in private meditation ripping up their ways, acknowledging their unworthiness, and craving grace for amendment, and that for a long space. The moderator thereafter made open confession, in name of the rest, of unthankfulness, forgetfulness, undutifulness, negligence, coldness, hardness of heart, darkness, senselessness, instability, vanity of mind, stubbornness, and rebellion of will, unsavouriness and folly of speech, and of conversation fashioned after the world, &c. Finally, trembling and weeping for the misuse of so honourable a calling, and quaking for fear that such a weight of wrath was lying over their heads, for the blood of so many souls belonging to their charge, all bitterly wept, and sought grace of God for amendment. After this confession, the moderator entered again upon the conference of Joshua with the elders and rulers; and so, after divers other points of doctrine, admonitions and exhortations for the purpose, by lifting up of the hand every man testified before God, and mutually one to another, the sincere and earnest purpose of the heart, to study to amend and serve God better in time to come, both in their private persons and in the great office of the ministry, &c. And, last, the moderator spake upon these words, 'Ye are witnesses this day against yourself,' &c., the which he applied to the present purpose. And so by their own consent it was agreed that a minute and sum of the whole actions should be insert and registered in the book of the Assembly, there to remain for their admonition and remembrance during their time, and for example to the posterity. Thereafter the moderator, remembering of the defection mentioned soon after the death of Joshua, and the fathers and elders that had seen the works of God in their days, for preventing of the like defection, and fastening of this new covenant the more firmly in the hearts of all the brethren of smaller age, required certain godly fathers and zealous brethren to speak, as they had seen and heard and helped to do in the great work of God, in

planting and preserving the Gospel, and liberty of Christ His kingdom, with sincerity in the land.”¹

This being their dealing with themselves, let us see how they endeavoured to deal with others. Before the reconciliation took place at Aberdeen, apprehensive that the State was negligent of duty touching the Popish lords, the Church placed them under the supervision of a police of their own. Certain clerical detectives were named under “instructions for the brethren appointed by the General Assembly to attend upon the Marquis of Huntly, the Earls of Angus and Errol, the Lords Hume, Herries, and Maxwell.” The most important of these instructions are: “First, Ye shall address yourselves with all convenient diligence and necessar furniture to enter in their company and families, there to remain still with them for the space of three months continual; during the whilk time your principal care shall be, by public doctrine, by reading and interpretation of the Scriptures ordinarily at their tables, and by conference at all mete occasions, to instruct themselves in the haille grounds of true religion and godliness, specially on the heads controverted, and confirm them therein. Second, Take pains to catechise their families ordinarily every day, once or twice at the least, or so oft as may serve to bring them to some reasonable measure of knowledge and feeling of religion before the expiry of the time prescribed for your remaining there; and let this action begin and end with prayer. Third, Press to have their houses purged of all persons living inordinately whose evil example might be a slander to their profession, especially such as are of suspect religion and found any ways busy in trafficking against the truth and quietness of the estate of the country; and be careful to have all such persons furth of their houses and company. Fourth, Travail to have their kirks planted with sufficient provision of stipends and well-qualified persons; and procure that by their authority and assistance the discipline of the Kirk may have execution within their bounds. Fifth, Persuade them to make honest provision of stipends for the entertainment of resident pastors

¹ Calderwood, v. 434, 435.

at their houses and chief dwelling-places, and to make choice of learned, grave, and wise pastors to be planted thereat.”¹

Perhaps this arrangement does not belong to the class of acts universally admitted to amount to persecution. And yet there are tortures attributed to the Inquisition which some men would rather endure than this scheme, dooming them and their families to be ever haunted by a pragmatistical priest of a hostile Church armed with powers of exhortation, inquisition, and rebuke. Though their authority only lasted for three months, one of their duties was to procure successors for life, with this small difference, that while they themselves were merely to receive temporary hospitality, the permanent tormentors were to be put on a permanent establishment at the expense of their victims. Some time before this domiciliary invasion was adopted, the General Assembly had set it forth that one of the national sins for which the wrath of God was let loose on the land was “the not planting sufficient pastors” in the houses of the Popish lords.²

The Church appointed a permanent committee in Edinburgh, who, we are told, “were continually attending the king, because they began to perceive that plots were laid down for the alteration of religion, or the bringing in of liberty of conscience at the least.”³ Their great standing grief was the leniency of the Government to the Popish lords. They had been conquered in battle—why were they not utterly crushed? No account could of course be taken of the worldly and worthless consideration, that the king might be desirous not to frighten a powerful community in that nation which he hoped might some day soon unanimously accept him as their king. The king assured his assailants that he would require the Popish lords to conform to the Church established before he would consent to the withdrawal of the forfeitures; and the Countess of Errol went as her husband’s ambassador to his own local synod of Moray, and offered to them his submission. The end of the negotiations, large

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 985.

² Calderwood, vi. 114.

³ Row’s History of the Kirk, 184.

and small, was the enacting of the edifying ceremony at Aberdeen. It must be conceded to their enemies that it was a solemn farce; and that whatever might be in words or the surface of things, there would be, when these earls were restored, a power in the north ready to co-operate with any Popish invader. Their enemies thought themselves strong enough to extirpate this power, and demanded that the idolaters should die the death. The permanent council established in Edinburgh was a very politic device for concentrating such power as the zealots possessed. Besides attending to the great matters of the supremacy of the Church and the extinction of Popery from the land, they performed some smaller duties in their vocation. They sent a deputation to the queen, "to speak and deal" with her, "first, touching her religion; second, her manners for favouring and dealing for the enemies of the truth—namely, the Earl of Huntly—and speaking contemptuously and reproachfully of the ministry; as also her want of godly and virtuous exercise among her maids, and spending of all time in vanity." ¹

There was other matter of greater moment to be looked to at Court. On the 19th of August a royal daughter was born at Falkland. This infant, entering the world in the midst of the troubles of others, was destined in after-life to drift upon her own sea of troubles as the unfortunate Elizabeth of Bohemia. The permanent council of the clergy had strong objection to the sponsor to be selected, and had other fears about the ceremony of the baptism; and "it was thought expedient that such of the nobility as should repair to this baptism" should "be spoken to" as "brethren had acquaintance and occasion." On the same day "it was thought needful that the council named octavians should be admonished of their duty," and, among other sins of omission, to be called to account for "their negligence in hearing the Word." ¹

So far the permanent council took upon them. They left a higher tone of rebuke to their superior court, the General Assembly, who found that in the palace "on the

¹ Calderwood, v. 459.

² Ibid., v. 462.

week day the repairing to the hearing of the Word is more rare than of before," and that "his majesty is blotted with banning and swearing, which is over-common in courtiers also, and moved by their example." There is a mutilated admonition about the company kept by the king, and a memorandum: "The queen's majesty's ministry to be reformed; and touching her company, her not repairing to the Word and sacraments, night-waking, balling, &c., and suchlike concerning her gentlewomen."¹

It was perhaps with the view of coming to a general estimate of the amount of work to be done by them in the shape of reformation, that at this time the Assembly came to a conclusion on "the common corruption of all estates within this land." The result certainly did not show that, with all its logical and ecclesiastical perfection, the Church had been heretofore successful as a moral trainer. The document opens about "an universal coldness and decay of zeal in all estates, joined with ignorance and contempt of the Word, ministry, and sacraments; and where knowledge is, no sense nor feeling; which it uttereth itself most manifestly by this, that they want religious exercises in their families, as of prayer and of reading of the Word; and where the same, for the most part abused and profaned by cooks, stewards, jackmen, and suchlike; the master of the families ashamed to use their exercises of godliness in their own persons, and no conference at their tables but of profane, wanton, and worldly matters.

"Superstition and idolatry is entertained, which uttereth itself in keeping of festival-days, bonfires, pilgrimages, singing of carols at Yule.

"Great blasphemy of the holy name of God in all estates, with horrible banning and cursing in all their speeches.

"Profanation of the Sabbath, and specially in seed-time and harvest, and common journeying on the Sabbath, and trysting and worldly turns, exercising all kind

¹ Calderwood, v. 409. "Night-waking" refers to wakes or festivals, and is not to be confounded with "walking."

of wanton games, keeping of markets, dancing, drinking, and siclike."

The document becomes somewhat more descriptive of prevailing vices than the decorous habits of modern literature would sanction, and ends with a curious memorandum of social conditions, in the prevalence of "idle persons having no lawful callings—as pipers, fiddlers, songsters, sorners, pleasants, strong sturdy beggars, living in harlotry, altogether contemning Word and sacraments. Lying, finally, is a rife and common sin."¹

The clergy, at the same time, looked to the ordering of their own house; and there they made provision for the remedy of defects sounding not less grotesque than those which were found to taint the lay community, and not calculated to give an impression that the bulk of the clergy were either very high-minded or very pure:—

"That such as are light and wanton in their behaviour—as in gorgeous or light apparel, in speech, in using light and profane company, unlawful gaming, as dancing, carding, dicing, and suchlike, not beseeming the gravity of ane pastor—be sharply and gravely rebuked by the presbytery, according to the degree thereof; and continuing therein after due admonition, that he be deprived as slanderous to the Gospel.

"That ministers being found swearers or banners, profaners of the Sabbath-day, drunkards, fighters, guilty of all these or any of them, to be deposed *simpliciter*; and suchlike liars, detractors, flatterers, breakers of promises, brawlers, and quarrellers, after due admonition, continuing therein, incur the same punishment.

"That ministers given to unlawful and incompetent trades for filthy gain—as holding of hostelries, taking of ocker [usury] beside good conscience and laws, and bearing worldly offices in noble and gentle men's houses, merchandise and suchlike, buying of victual and keeping to dearth, and all other worldly occupations as may distract them from their charge and be slander to the pastoral calling—be admonished and brought to the acknowledg-

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 873; Calderwood, v. 409, 410.

ment of their faults ; and if they continue therein to be deposed.”¹

Let us now follow up the political conclusion to which the activity and zeal of the ecclesiastical leaders was bringing the Church itself.

In August 1596 there was a meeting of the Estates in Falkland, where they acted as a great council to discuss the case of the Popish lords. It was arranged that a deputation of ministers should also attend. Andrew Melville was not one of these. The king did not desire his presence, and it even appears that he was not chosen by his own brethren to serve on the deputation. Still he was there, and by no means in a humour to conceal his presence. To obviate any dubiety and confusion, it was arranged that the members of the deputation should be individually invited into the hall by name. By the younger Melville's account, “the king causes the ministers to be called upon by name, and letten in—leaving out Mr Andrew, who came in with the foremost. The king finding fault with him that came there uncalled, he answers: ‘Sir, I have a calling to come here by Christ Jesus the King, and His Kirk, who has special interest in this business, and against which directly this convention is met ; charging you and your Estates in His name, and of His Kirk, that you favour not His enemies whom He hates, nor go not about to call home and make citizens these that have traitorously sought to betray their city and native country to the cruel Spaniard, with the overthrow of Christ's kingdom, for the which they have been therefore most justly cut off as rotten members ; certifying, if they should do in the contrary, they should feel the dint of the wrath of that king and his Estates !’ And, breaking on in particular upon the greatest part of that convention, with plain speech and mighty force of zeal he challenged them of high treason, both against Christ and the king, against the Kirk and country of Scotland, in that purpose and counsel they were about. But the king interrupted him, and commanded him to go out ; whose

¹ Book of the Universal Kirk, 866.

command he obeyed, thanking God that they had known his mind, and got His message discharged.”¹

In the following September there was an Assembly at Cupar, in Fife. The king was at Falkland, but a few miles off, and a deputation was sent to him. How that deputation fared cannot be so well told as in the words of the younger Melville:—

“So Mr Andrew Melville, Patrick Galloway, James Nicolson, and I came to Falkland, where we found the king very quiet. The rest laid upon me to be speaker, alleging I could propone the matter substantially, and in a mild and smooth manner, which the king liked best of. And entering in the cabinet with the king alone, I show his majesty that the commissioners of the General Assembly, with certain other brethren ordained to watch for the well of the Kirk in so dangerous a time, had convened at Cupar. At the which word the king interrupts me, and angrily quarrels our meeting, alleging it was without warrant and seditious, making ourselves and the country to conceive fear where there was no cause. To the which I beginning to reply in my manner, Mr Andrew could not abide it, but broke off upon the king in so zealous, powerful, and irresistible a manner, that howbeit the king used his authority in most crabbed and choleric manner, yet Mr Andrew bore him down, and uttered the commission as from the mighty God, calling the king but ‘God’s silly vassal;’ and taking him by the sleeve, says this in effect, through much hot reasoning and many interruptions: ‘Sir, we will humbly reverence your majesty always—namely, in public. But since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and the truth is, you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and Kirk of Christ is like to wreck, for not telling you the truth, and giving of you a faithful council,—we must discharge our duty therein, or else be traitors both to Christ and you! And therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, there are two Kings and two Kingdoms in Scotland.

¹ Melville’s Diary, 368.

There is Christ Jesus the King, and His Kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James the Sixth is—and of whose kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member! And they whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Kirk and govern His spiritual kingdom, has sufficient power of Him and authority so to do both together and severally; the which no Christian king nor prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise not faithful subjects nor members of Christ.”¹

There was much more of this, but perhaps enough has been given to reveal the character of the scene. Perhaps the best testimony we have of the young king's power to command his temper is in the conclusion, where the diarist says he dismissed the unwelcome visitors pleasantly, with many attestations that he knew not of the returning of the Popish lords till they had returned, and that “they would get no grace at his hand till they satisfied the Kirk.”

It was arranged that the pulpits should open upon the king with a general discharge, like a broadside in a sea-fight. It so happened that one of their occupants, David Black, from his pulpit in St Andrews, fired at Queen Elizabeth as well as his own peculiar enemy. In the course of a testimony against the Prelatic Church of England, he applied to its head, the queen, among other terms, that of “atheist.” Bowes, the English ambassador, demanded an explanation on the report made to him, that a subject of a power in close alliance with England had so spoken of his sovereign. A better opportunity for becomingly beginning the struggle could not have been invented. Black was cited before the tribunal of the king in Council to answer for the words spoken by him.

The matter was discussed by the clerical council, who determined that their brother should not appear. They put their reasons into a State paper called “The Declina-tour of the King and Council's judicature in matters

¹ Melville's Diary, 369, 370. It may be noted that the word “silly,” as used in Scotland, means merely weak, and is more frequently applied to physical than mental weakness.

spiritual—namely, in preaching of the Word : given in to the same at Halyrood House by Mr David Black, minister at St Andrews, in his own name, and name of his whole brethren of the ministry, the 18th day of November 1596.” A copy of this paper was transmitted to each presbytery of the Church, accompanied by a persuasive letter appropriate to the text, “If we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him (Romans, viii.),” in which each minister was desired to sign “The Declinatour.”¹

There was a formal trial before the king in Council, with evidence led. Black was convicted, and the judgment was that he should “enter his person in ward” somewhere beyond the North Esk river.² These matters naturally raised some excitement in Edinburgh, which was increased by an order in Council, that certain clergymen, and twenty-four zealous burgesses who were believed to be their abettors, should remove from the city. Rumours about violent counsels and a bloody persecution were circulated, and it had been said that the great enemy Huntly himself had been with the king late at night. This was improved by Mr Walter Balcanquhall, who had to preach in St Giles’s; and after a vehement address, he suggested that the faithful should hold a meeting in one of the chapels of St Giles called “the little church.” Thither they rushed, and there was all the confusion incident to a larger number than a place can hold scrambling for admission. A portion of those present, were hurriedly resolved into a deputation to wait on the king. He was with some of the Council hard by in the Tolbooth, where the Estates and the courts of law held their meetings. The excited deputation broke in upon the meeting, followed by a miscellaneous crowd. After some hasty talk, the king left the room and closed himself into the court-room where the Lords of Session were sitting. The deputation went back to the little church to announce that they had not been heard. As of all affairs of the

¹ Calderwood, v. 457-460. The text is not in Romans, but in

² Timothy, ii. 12.

² Calderwood, v. 498.

kind, the accounts are confused and various. The following, which is the most picturesque, must also be noted as the Episcopalian account:—

“They that were sent, returning to the church, show that they were not heard; nor was there any hope, so long as the counsellors remained about the king, that they should receive any favourable answer, and were therefore to think of some other course.

“‘No course,’ said the Lord Lindesay, ‘but one: let us stay together that are here, and promise to take one part, and advertise our friends and the favourers of religion to come with us; for it shall be either theirs or ours.’ Upon these speeches followed such a clamour and lifting up of hands, as none could hear what another spake. The sedition increasing, some cried to arm, others to bring out Haman (for whilst the lords were with the king, Mr Michael Cranstone, minister of Cramond, had been reading to the people that story); others cried, ‘The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!’ and so great was the fury of the people, as if one of the deacons of crafts, called John Wat, had not kept them back with a guard of craftsmen that followed him, they had undoubtedly forced the doors and wrought some mischief. Sir Alexander Hume, provost of the town, was then lying sick; yet being told what a tumult was raised, he came to the street, and as he was wise and skilful in handling the people, with his fair speeches brought them after a little time to lay down their weapons and retire to their lodgings.”¹

Whatever there was of the nature of a riot was soon over, for the king and his Council walked quietly down to Holyrood. Next morning the Court retreated, or rather fled, to Linlithgow.

Of that British institution called, towards the close of last century, a “no-Popery mob,” Edinburgh thus enjoyed the distinction of possessing the oldest specimen. It was yet, however, in its infancy, and the flight of the Court, as if in terror, was either a folly or a pretence. It was determined, however, to seize the opportunity. At the

¹ Spottiswoode, 429.

market-cross of Edinburgh a proclamation was issued, intimating that the king, seeing that by persuasion of the ministers "a multitude of the townsmen had treasonably put themselves in arms, intending to bereave his majesty and the Council of their lives,—did think the said town an unfit place for the ministration of justice, and therefore had ordained the Lords of Session, sheriffs, commissaries, and justices, with their several members and deputies, to remove themselves forth out of the town of Edinburgh, and repair unto such place as should be appointed."

This was a formidable announcement to the burgesses ; and if its completion might array them in enmity to the Court, the fear of such a result cooled any devotion they might have to the clergy who were bringing on the calamity. A pacificatory influence was thus established ; the elements of discord subsided, and on the 1st of January 1597 the king re-entered his capital in such placid state as was likened to a classic triumph. A group of the more zealous clergy at the same time thought it wise to take refuge in England, since it was announced by the Court that the riot was to be dealt with as an act of treason, and the magistrates offered to deliver up those who had fostered it.

CHAPTER LXI.

TO THE UNION OF THE CROWNS.

CONTEST WITH THE ECCLESIASTICS—THEIR CRITICISM ON THE KING AS AN AUTHOR—EPISCOPACY AGAIN TRIUMPHANT—THE KING HUNTING IN FALKLAND—BEGUILED TO GOWRIE HOUSE—THE ADVENTURE THERE KNOWN AS THE GOWRIE CONSPIRACY—THE REVELATIONS SHOWING THE IMMEDIATE INTENTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS—THE MYSTERY ABOUT THEIR ULTIMATE OBJECTS—POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF THIS MYSTERY—THE DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES OF THE CLERGY—POSITION OF THE ENGLISH SUCCESSION—CONFIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE—ENGLISH STATESMEN TURNING TO THE RISING SUN—THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

It was now resolved to hold a General Assembly in the king's name. The place of meeting was to be at Perth. This was a thoroughly wise measure. No one could complain that the spot was partially chosen, since no other considerable town is so unmistakably in the centre of Scotland. The zealots with whom we have heretofore had to deal were concentrated in Fife and Mid-Lothian. In the north, Protestantism tended more to an Episcopal texture. There the zealots had been dictatorial, and were styled "the Popes of Edinburgh." They had assumed authority for the Church at large, and had done many things which made their northern brethren not only ashamed but angry. An Assembly, supplied from the north as well as the south, and also unusually large, thus met in February. The great matters at issue were discussed under a preliminary document called the fifty-five

questions. These, and the discussion on them, are as intricate as a long lawsuit, and would be as little interesting to the lay reader. I adopt from a clerical pen what appears to be a fair and clear abridgment of the chief results :—

“The answers, as first framed, did not satisfy his majesty ; but the Assembly was compliant, and they were so altered as to gratify his wish. In these answers it was declared lawful for his majesty to propose to the General Assembly any matter affecting the external government of the Church which he might wish to see discussed or reformed ; no minister was to reprove his majesty’s laws till he had first sought a remedy through the Church courts ; no man’s name was to be mentioned in pulpit rebukes unless his sin was notorious, and notoriety was defined to consist in the person being fugitive, convicted by an assize, excommunicated, or contumacious ; no minister was to use any application in his sermon but such as had for its object the edifying of his own flock ; the presbyteries were to take diligent account of the doctrine of every pastor within their bounds ; every summons issued by Church courts was to mention the cause and the crime ; the ministers were not to hold any meetings beyond the ordinary sessions, presbyteries, and synods ; and in all the principal towns the ministers were to be chosen with the consent of the congregation and the king.”¹

In November there was a meeting of the Estates, who passed a very significant Act. It narrated the king’s affection for the true and holy Kirk of Scotland, and provided that “such pastors and ministers within the same as at any time his majesty shall please to provide to the office, place, title, and dignity of ane Bishop, Abbot, or other Prelate, shall at all time hereafter have vote in Parliament, suchlike and as freely as any other ecclesiastical prelate had any time bygone.”² This, it will be noted, made no interference with the internal discipline of the Church ; the prelate was to be a lord of the secular

¹ Cunningham’s History of the Church of Scotland, i. 543.

² Act. Parl., iv. 130.

Parliament, but the Act gave him no spiritual jurisdiction or precedency over the clergy. It contained one clause on which they might act. None but actual ministers were to be promoted to the new dignities; and it would rest with the Church itself to decide whether it would permit the acceptor of such a dignity to remain in its bosom.

In the year 1600 the Church met the spirit, though not the form of this Act, in an independent measure of its own. It authorised the Church to be represented in Parliament by certain ministers, each of whom was to be selected by the king out of a leet of six. They were to be called Commissioners, and to devolve their power annually back on the General Assembly. In the Church they were only to be ministers. Archbishop Spottiswood says, with much meaning: "To have matters peaceably ended, and the reformation of the policy made without any noise, the king gave way to these concerts, knowing that with time the utility of the government which he proposed to have established would appear, and trusting that they whom he should place in these rooms would, by their care for the Church, and their wise and good behaviour, purchase to themselves the authority which appertained."¹

Now the zealots had tried their powers and found them insufficient even with their own order. In their retreat from the contest, however, a Parthian arrow was aimed very adroitly at the king. He had been busy with the 'Basilikon Doron' already referred to. Certain passages had been obtained from this book by a lover of mischief, who so directed them that they found their way to the synod of Fife as the production of an unknown author. The assertions of divine right and uncontrolled authority over all orders of men would be all the more irritating to such a body that they were gathered out of various parts of the book and put in sequence. It would be hard to say whether the clergy were sincere in discussing the passages as the work of an author unknown: "The synod judged them treasonable, seditious, and wicked, thinking that such things should not be, and directed them to the

¹ Vol. iii. 82.

king.”¹ How his majesty took this hint to deal with the treasonable and seditious writings of an unknown author we are not told; but the affair became his excuse for having the complete book published.

The last year of the sixteenth century in Scotland is marked by the calendar then and ever after beginning the year with the 1st of January. The same year, 1600, became memorable in Scotland for the mysterious affair called the Gowrie Conspiracy, of which some account must now be given.

The story begins at six o'clock on the morning of Tuesday the 5th of August, when the king and his retinue had assembled to have a buck-hunt in the park of Falkland, in Fifeshire. As the king was going to mount, a youth made his appearance, and was recognised as Alexander Ruthven, the brother of the Earl of Gowrie, known as the Master of Gowrie. He approached the king anxiously, and knelt, making a very low reverence—a reverence which, as it was remarked at the time, was not consistent with his usual practice. He had a very odd affair to reveal. The evening before, taking a meditative walk in the fields, he beheld a man of a suspicious aspect, with a cloak wrapped closely round him, which partially concealed his face. On closer inspection it was found that he concealed a bulky article under his cloak. The article was examined, and found to be a pot or urn filled with foreign gold pieces, enough to make a rich prize. Ruthven said he seized the man, and unassisted, conveyed him into a distant chamber, where he would be thoroughly concealed, and there left him bound.

The king, by his own account, said he could not see how he was interested in the matter. Had the money been found underground, it would have been treasure-trove, and thus the property of the Crown; but he had no right to take it from its owner. Ruthven remarked that virtually it was in this position, for the unknown stranger said he was going to bury it; but he made more progress by rousing suspicions in the king about foreign

¹ Melville's Diary, 444.

supplies brought for distribution among the Roman Catholics by some trafficking priest. The king proposed to send a messenger to direct the magistrates of Perth to detain both the man and his treasure until the royal pleasure should be further intimated to them. But this did not satisfy Ruthven. If the magistrates of Perth and his brother got scent of the money, his majesty would have small share of it; and in his zealous loyalty Ruthven desired that the king should have the whole. But the game was started, the followers were all mounted and impatient for the hunt, so the king rode off with them, saying he would ponder over this marvellous affair.

As he pondered, it began to take hold of his mind. The chase was an exciting one, "being one of the greatest and sorest chases that ever his majesty was at;" but the excitement of the news almost overcame that of the chase. The king lagged behind, and sent for Ruthven. He said he had made up his mind to ride to Perth when the chase was over, and kept Ruthven by him as he followed the rest. It was about eleven o'clock ere the buck was killed. The king did not stop to essay the quarry, according to his wont, but rode off with his companion. There was so much impatience on the one or the other part, that though his horse was exhausted, he rode on, directing a fresh horse to be sent after him; and he merely explained to those around him at the moment that he was going to St John's Town, at that time the usual name for Perth, to speak with the Earl of Gowrie. The king maintained that Ruthven pressed him not to take Mar, Lennox, and the rest of his train, lest they might mar the purpose on hand, and to content himself with three of his menial domestics; but in this he would not be ruled. About twenty horsemen accompanied him to Perth, about twelve miles from Falkland.

As the king rode on, he beckoned to the Duke of Lennox, the son of his old favourite D'Aubigné, who was some half-dozen years younger than himself. "His highness inquired of him," he said, "of what humour he thought Mr Alexander to be of? who answered, that he knew nothing of him but as an honest discreet gentle-

man." Then the king told the story of the treasure ; on which, by his own account, Lennox said, " I like not that, sir, for it is not likely." Twice he said the king told him to take notice when he passed aside with Alexander Ruthven, and to follow him. On reaching Bridge of Earn, Alexander rode on before, and brought his brother, the earl, with a few followers, to meet the cavalcade on the South Inch.

The absurdity of the king's conduct naturally staggers, on the very threshold of the adventure, any one to whom his character is new. But familiarity with his ways and moods will reconcile one to his conduct in this affair. He had ever a diseased appetite for the unrolling of secrets. Partly it was an impulsive boyish curiosity ; but partly, also, it was an indulgence in a self-conceited reliance on his own wonderful capacity for solving mysteries which baffled all the scrutiny of less-gifted investigators. We shall find, too, that he delighted in the casual acquisition of a sum of money coming to him as a private pose which no State exigency could drain off. Thus the Ruthvens had skilfully assailed two of the weak elements in his character.

The site of Gowrie House will be recognised by that of the county jail and court-house of Perth, to make room for which it was removed at the beginning of the present century. Fortunately, accurate plans and drawings have been preserved, which let us see all the scenes of the curious drama that was to be enacted within its walls. It was said that there were within it many ancient vaults and recesses ; but externally it was a turreted chateau in the French style, then prevalent in Scotland, and was in all respects the handsome town hotel of a wealthy family. The front was towards the town, where there was a high wall and an entrance-gate. At right angles to this wall two ranges of high buildings made the north and the south boundary of a courtyard ; while towards the river another building, parallel to the wall, nearly completed the four sides of a quadrangle. The gables of the two buildings to the north and to the south were a continuation of the wall, so that the windows of them looked out upon the

town. At the south-east corner of the northern building, and consequently overhanging the wall, was the turret or "round" where the great adventure of the day occurred. A little to the west of this was a narrow turnpike stair called "the black turnpike," probably because it was windowless and dark; and it has to be noted that this gave direct access to the "round" or turret, while the great staircase did not. At the corner of the quadrangle where the building on the west side stood at right angles to the northern wing, there was a narrow square projecting tower which contained this great staircase. Behind the house were gardens; and it is important to observe that these sloped to the edge of the Tay, there a strong stream, deep, and navigable by small craft. To those unacquainted with the spot, it may be sufficient to note that in front of the house there was a town, and behind it a river.

There was no hospitable preparation in the house for the reception of a royal guest. The king's followers saw, or afterwards imagined that they had seen, an appearance of excitement, restlessness, and anxiety in the deportment of the two brothers. An effort was made to provide such a repast as a noble household might supply to distinguished but unexpected guests. The minute investigations subsequently made, reveal to us the items of the king's dinner on that day. George Craigengelt, the cook, testified that he was told of the sudden arrival, and ordered to cook dinner for the king. When he came to the kitchen he "found no appearance of meat for the king." His first step was to "send out to Duncan Robertson's house, where he got a murefowl." Thereafter he "caused make ready a shoulder of mutton and a hen, whilk was long in doing; and he thereafter went up and brought down some strawberries, and dressed five or six dishes of dessert."

The king dined in a separate apartment on the ground-floor of the north wing; the attendants dined in the great hall on the same floor. To these the earl came with a cup of wine, telling them that the king had sent it that they might drink the "skall" to him, a term which he had probably brought from Denmark.

Soon after this Alexander Ruthven beckoned the king aside. Lennox said he asked the earl where the king had gone to, and got for answer "that his majesty was gone up quietly some quiet errand." The earl then, according to Lennox, called for the key of the garden, and went into it, lounging with a few of the courtiers—it was a summer day, and just after dinner. Thomas Cranston, one of the earl's domestics, came speedily into the garden, calling out that the king had gone forth by the back gate, and was riding through the Inch. On that the earl cried out, "Horse! horse!" and though his domestic told him that his horses were on the other side of the Tay, he still continued the cry. Lennox passed through the quadrangle to the gate, and asked the porter if the king had gone forth, but was told that he had not. The earl then said he would go and get certain intelligence; and returning, he assured them that the king had gone out by the back gate, and was well on his way. On this the group of courtiers passed out, and stood, apparently in hesitation and consultation, in front of the gate. There they were close under the turret which overhung the wall from the corner of the north wing. Lennox testified that as they stood there he "heard a voice, and said to the Earl of Mar, 'This is the king's voice that cries, be he where he will:' and so," he continues, "they all looked up to the lodging, and saw his majesty looking furth of the window wanting his hat, his face being red, and one hand gripping his cheek and mouth; and the king cried, 'I am murdered! Treason! My Lord Mar, help! help!'"

How this group acted when they beheld this startling vision may best be told from the testimony of Lennox: "They all ran up the stair of the gallery-chamber, where his majesty was, to have relieved him; and as they passed up they found the door of the chamber fast; and seeing a ladder standing beside, they rasht at the door with the ladder, and the steps of the ladder brake: and syne they send for hammers; and notwithstanding large forcing with hammers, they got not entry at the said chamber until after the Earl of Gowrie and his brother were both slain; that Robert Brown past about by the

back door, and came to his majesty, and assured his highness that it was my lord duke and the Earl of Mar that was stricking up the chamber-door; and the hammer was given through the hole of the door of the chamber, and they within brake the door and gave them entry: and at their first entry they saw the Earl of Gowrie lying dead in the chamber, Mr Alexander Ruthven being slain and taken down the stairs before their entry; and at their first entry within that chamber where the king's majesty was, the deponent saw sundry halberts and swords stricking under the door of the chamber and sides thereof, by reason the same was nae closs door; and knew none of the strickers, except Alexander Ruthven, one of the defenders, who desired to speak with this deponent through the door, and speird at him, 'For God's sake tell me how my Lord of Gowrie was!' to whom this deponent answered, 'He is well:' and the said deponent bad Alexander to gang his way; and that he was ane fool."

We must now follow the other actors in the tragedy to the turret chamber. The king, when he was beckoned away, said he desired one or two followers to attend him; but Ruthven objected, and they went together. Passing up the great staircase, and along a corridor, Ruthven took him through several chambers, ever locking each door behind him. When they came to the turret chamber, instead of a chained captive, the king beheld an armed man standing there.

In the narrative afterwards issued by authority, which may be called the king's narrative, there is a minute account of the scene acted within the turret chamber. The man in armour gave his story of it once in a preliminary examination, and again on the trial. His two accounts substantially agree with each other, and with the king's account; and as it would be useless to attempt to correct what he says if we should suppose his story incorrect, it seems to be the best plan to give here the narrative as taken down and recorded from his second and fuller testimony:—

"Mr Alexander opens the door of the room, and entered first within the same, having the king's majesty by the

arm ; and putting on his hat upon his head, draws forth this Andrew Henderson deponent's hanger, and says to the king, having the drawn hanger in his hand, ' Sir, you must be my prisoner ; remember on my father's death.' And as he held the hanger to his majesty's breast, this deponent threw the samen furth of Mr Alexander's hands. And the time that Mr Alexander held the hanger to his majesty's breast, the king was beginning to speak. The Master said, ' Hold your tongue, sir, or, by Christ, ye shall die !' Then his majesty answered, ' Mr Alexander, ye and I were very great together ; and as touching your father's death, man, I was but a minor. My Council might have done anything they pleased. And farther, man, albeit ye bereave me of my life, ye will not be King of Scotland ; for I have both sons and daughters ; and there are men in this town and friends that will not leave it unrevenged.' Then Mr Alexander answered, swearing with a great oath, that it was neither his life nor blood that he craved. And the king said, ' What traiks albeit ye take off your hat ;' and then Mr Alexander took off his hat. And the king said, ' What is it ye crave, man, an ye crave not my life?' Who answered, ' Sir, it is but a promise.' The king answered, ' What promise?' The said Mr Alexander answered, ' For my lord my brother will tell you.' The king said, ' Fetch hither your brother.' And syne the said Mr Alexander said to the king, ' Sir, you will not cry nor open the window while I come again?' And the king promised so to do. Then Mr Alexander passed forth and locked, and passed not from the door, as he believes. In the mean time the king entered in discourse with this deponent, ' How came you in here, man?' And this deponent answered, ' As God lives, I am shot in here like a dog.' The king answered, ' Will my Lord of Gowrie do me any evil, man?' This deponent answered, ' I vow to God, I shall die first.' And then the king bad this deponent open the window, and he opened the window that looked to the Spey tower ; and the king answered, ' Fy, the wrong window, man !' And thereafter, this deponent passing to the other window nearest his majesty to open the same, before he got to the

window, Mr Alexander opened the door and came in again, and said to his majesty, 'By God! there is no remedy;' and then he louns to the king, and got him by both the hands, having ane garter in his hands. Then the king answered, 'I am a free prince, man; I will not be bound;' so his majesty cast loose his left hand from Mr Alexander, and at the same time this deponent draws away the garter from Mr Alexander, and his majesty louns free from the said Mr Alexander, and the said Mr Alexander follows his majesty, and with his left hand about his majesty's craig, puts his right neeve in his majesty's mouth. So his majesty wrestling to be quit of him, this deponent puts his hand out of his majesty's mouth. And thereafter this deponent did put his left hand over his majesty's left shoulder, and pulled up the broad of the window, whereunto the said Mr Alexander had thrust his majesty's head and shoulders; and with the force of the drawing up of the window, presses his majesty's body about, his right side to the window; at which time his majesty cries furth, 'Treason! treason!' So the Master said to this deponent, 'Is there no help with thee? Wo worth thee, thou villain! we all die.' So twining his hand on the guard of his own sword; and incontinent the king's majesty put his hand on the Master's hands and staid him from drawing of his sword; and this ways, they both being grasped together, comes furth of the cabinet to the chamber; and in the mean time this deponent threw about the key, then standing in the door of the head of the turnpike which entered to the chamber, and opened the door thereof, to eschew himself, and to let his majesty's servants in; and how soon he opened the door, John Ramsay came in at the said door with an haulk on his hand, and passed to the king's majesty and laid about him, and drew his hanger; and as he saw him minting with the hanger, this deponent passed furth at the said door and passed down the turnpike."

We may now look to the manner of this rescue, which arrived earlier than the party at the gate who heard the king's cry, having taken a shorter way than theirs, which

was by the great staircase. Sir John Ramsay, a young man of twenty-three years, was one of the king's party. He had eaten of the dinner provided for them in Gowrie House; and seeing that John Murray, who held the king's hawk, was going to dine, he relieved him of the hawk. Missing the king, like the others he "forgathered" with the Laird of Pittencrieff in the great hall, and asked him where his majesty was. Pittencrieff took him to the chamber where the king had dined, then to the yard; and not finding the king in either, took him to "a fair gallery," so fair that "both remained a certain space beholding the gallery." They then came down to the quadrangle outside, where Thomas Cranston informed them that the king was away riding through the Inch. On this the two separated, and Ramsay went out at the gate—the same where the others heard the cry—to the stable to get his horse. Standing at the stable-door, "he heard his majesty cry—knew his majesty's voice, but understood not what he spake." He ran back into the court, and observed the door of the black turnpike open. He ran up the narrow winding stair. Finding a closed door, and hearing from the other side of it "a struggling and din of men's feet," he threw himself against the door and burst it open. He saw the group within—the man in armour standing placidly apart, but the other two in desperate struggle, "his majesty having Mr Alexander's head under his arm, and Mr Alexander being almost on his knees, had his hand upon his majesty's face and mouth." The king called to him to strike low, "because he has ane pyne doublet" or secret coat of mail. Ramsay, thus instructed, stabbed Ruthven. The king then with his own hands hurled the wounded man down-stairs. Sir Thomas Erskine and Sir Hugh Herries coming up, Herries extinguished what life was in him; "and as he was fallen, he turned his face and cried, 'Alas! I had na wyte of it'"—that is, that he was not to blame. Ramsay said that when he drew his dagger he had to let go the king's hawk; and he noticed that the king set his foot on the hawk's leash, and so kept it till Ramsay could hold it again. Ramsay was joined by Sir Thomas Erskine,

whom he saw and called up from the window. Before this the man in armour had disappeared.

Thus all that happened within the turret made a very distinct story. What was going on outside was more confused. There was in the quadrangle and the street in front a general tumult and exchange of hasty words. Some men were observed carrying in a wooden beam, as if to batter in a door. There was a sense of some great danger; but whether it had befallen the Gowrie party or the king's party was uncertain. Gowrie himself was moving about like one flustered and powerless. One of the king's followers said, that after the king's cry had been heard from the turret window, "he saw James Erskine incontinent lay hands on the Earl of Gowrie upon the High Street; and immediately Sir Thomas Erskine gripped the Earl of Gowrie, who incontinent ran the space of half a pair of butlands from them towards Glenurchy's house, and drew forth his two swords and cried, 'I will either be at my own house or die by the gate.'" So he entered the gate followed by about thirty men. One of his followers named Cranston said he found the earl struggling at the gate with some of Tullibardine's people, and that he relieved him from their hands. He then asked his master "what the fray was, and what he should do;" and only hearing from him something about going to his own house, he said he would go on before, but prayed his master to tell him "whom at he would strike, for he knew not wha was party." As they pressed onwards, some one put "a steel bonnet" on the earl's head, and this bonnet was recognised by the man in armour as his own. People cried out that his brother was slain. Coming to the black turnpike, they found him at the foot of the stair. The earl called out to his followers, "Up the stair." Five of them accompanied him up the black turnpike, all with drawn swords. Ascending, they found at the door of the turret chamber "Herries presenting his sword to stop the entry." Cranston said, "Yail thief, dare thou!" and, "Thief, if thou be innocent of yon slaughter, come forth and I shall warrant thee."

At the door of the turret chamber they were six to the three within, who were the king, Ramsay, and Erskine. There was some show of fighting between the two parties, and one or two were hurt. Here again it was Ramsay's fortune to give the final and effective blow. According to Erskine's account, he "heard my Lord of Gowrie speak some words at his entry, but understands them not. At last Sir John Ramsay gave the Earl of Gowrie ane dead stroke, and then the earl leaned him on his sword, and the deponer saw ane man hold him up, whom he knew not."

This, the great act of the tragedy, which can have only lasted a few minutes, passed unknown to Lennox, Mar, and the others who had rushed up the great staircase, as we have seen, on the first exhibition of the king's face at the turret window. They were met by a strong door, which no efforts that they could make with hammers, axes, and a ladder used as a battering-ram, could force. They heard the mysterious sounds of what was doing on the other side. The party in the turret from their side heard the cries and the battering at the door, without knowing whether it betokened friends or enemies; the former were the majority, but among them were Eviot, a page, and other retainers of the house of Ruthven. The turret party did not know the character of the group till one came round by the black turnpike and told them. To understand the exact position of the two groups it is necessary to remember that the turret chamber, or the round, as it was termed, was a recess off a larger chamber. Into this larger chamber the black turnpike entered; but between the chamber and the great staircase was the door that defied its assailants from the outside, and only gave way when attacked from the inside of the chamber.

While these events passed, the town of Perth became excited into high uproar. The common bell or tocsin kept tolling—the bell that of old called the burgesses to meet the "auld enemies of England," but had in later times chiefly warned the citizens of the approach of marauding bands of Highlanders. It was impossible that the multitude should at once know the whole that passed

within the turreted mansion ; but rumours passed among them that there had been violence, bloodshed, even death, and that their own provost, the head of the mighty house of Ruthven, and one mightier still, the king himself, with his body of courtiers, had been actual participators in the violent fray. The house of Ruthven was very popular throughout the district, and at first the excitement of the mob took a tone of serious menace towards the king and his party. The English clergy, in their anniversary commemorations of the king's escape, made the tumult a substantial item of his perils.¹ One cried, "Come down, thou son of Seigneur Davie ! thou hast slain an honest man than thyself." There were angry allusions to the men in green, the colour of the royal uniform ; and one cried out, "Give us our provost, or the king's green coat shall pay for it." One would say, "Green coats, ye have committed murder ;" and others called them by such epithets as murderers and butchers.²

Some of the crowd demanded that they might see the king, others that they might see the provost. Of what could be noted and remembered in the confusion, the following testimony by a citizen called Alexander Peebles may be cited as a fair specimen. He was in a better position for observation than others, for he said that "during all the time of the tumult he was locked in his own house and looking out at the window ; heard Thomas Bisset crying up at the round, 'Is my Lord of Gowrie

¹ See Hailes on the Gowrie conspiracy, *Annals*, iii. 474. He quotes Bishop Andrews in 1608 : "Last of all, and that worst of all, came the popular tumult, whose rage knows no reason ; who as they called Kora and Dathan the people of the Lord, so these little better ; and even then also did God by His mighty providence turn away the destruction."

² The "green" is often alluded to as if it were the royal livery or uniform, yet this is generally believed to have been red. James seems to have worn "the green" in field-sports for some little time after his arrival in England. Francis Osborne, noting one of his earliest hunting expeditions in England, says : "I shall leave him dressed to posterity in the colours I saw him in the next progress after his inauguration, which was as green as the grass he trod on, with a feather in his cap, and a horn instead of a sword by his side." —*Secret History*, i. 197.

alive? if he be not alive, he should have amends of all that was therein ;' and James Bower cried up the like speeches : would not depart till they saw my Lord of Gowrie ; and ane of them two cried up, ' Green coats, we shall have amends of you ! ' wagging their hands up, saying, ' Ye shall pay for it ! ' Heard Thomas Elder in Bulbuchtie cry up for ane sight of the Earl of Gowrie. Heard Thomas Taylor cry, ' Traitors and thieves, that has slain the Earl of Gowrie. ' Saw John Rintoul, Thomas Bisset, and others of the earl's servants, stand in the entry of the Foregate with swords in their hands, and would not come from it. Saw one of the Earl of Gowrie's lackies at the entry of the gate put ane steel bonnet on the earl's head. Heard Violet Ruthven and other women cry, ' Traitors ! thieves ! The Earl of Gowrie had enow to take meat and drink from him, but has nane to revenge his death ! ' " ¹

The king and his followers dealt soothingly with the irritated mob, and with the assistance of the municipal authorities got them appeased, and for the greater part dispersed to their homes and occupations. The town was in some measure propitiated by the municipality being left in charge of Gowrie House and the two dead men within. Still it was not deemed safe to attempt a passage from the house on the side of the town, so the king and his party took boat and dropped down the river. They went straight to Falkland, where the presence of the magistrates was demanded, and they were questioned and in some measure censured in relation to the tumults.

There hardly can be named a crime or act of violence as to which there stands on record so minute and full an examination as there is of " the Gowrie Conspiracy. " Every one who could speak to the facts was examined twice—by the executive, who prepared the case for the Crown, and the Estates, who gave judgment on it—and both records are preserved. Farther, the municipality, at the desire of the king, held a general court of inquiry among the whole " indwellers " in Perth, that they might discover all who had anything to say about the event ; so

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, ii. 200.

there was an examination "of the hail inhabitants of the said burgh, beginning at the Water Gate quarter, and so, orderly through the hail quarters and suburbs of the said burgh." To these inquiries there are still extant the answers or testimony of three hundred and fifty-five persons. By far the greater portion had nothing to tell. Of what those who had observed anything could say, some specimens have just been given. The whole examination affords us a curious and minute picture of a burghal community of that period called out by a wild alarm about some emergency or danger, they knew not what. Some come forth in full armour with marvellous rapidity; others seize a sword, a tool, or even a stick; while some few appear to have been locked into their houses or workshops by judicious females of their family desirous to keep them out of mischief.¹ In fact the king was in high glory both at his miraculous escape, which seemed a special intervention for the preservation of a life so valuable, and at the prowess he had himself displayed. He was therefore eager for all inquiry and discussion, and thought the world could not be better employed than in investigating the affair and proclaiming the result. It must be admitted that the scattered heap of evidence thus conjured up holds well together, and completes a consistent story, even to minute and trifling details.

The struggle at the turret window was seen by several citizens. In fact it was almost as public, and quite as distinctly authenticated, as the method of any public execution. When the citizens of Perth were afterwards examined in detail, several of them described the scene just as Lennox told it. One of these, for instance, Andrew Ray, bailie in Perth, heard Ruthven's statement that the king had gone, and the porter's assurance that he had not. Standing with the confused group at the gate, he accurately confirms from without what the others had testified

¹ See the "Report by the Bailies and Town Council of Perth of the Examinations and Depositions of the Indwellers in Perth, taken by them by command of the King and Privy Council."—Pitcairn, ii. 192 *et seq.*

both without and within. He noticed the opening of the turret window: "I saw ane ding up the lang-scored window in the north side of the turret, upon the Highgate; but wha dang it up I know not. And further saw clearly his majesty, bareheaded, shoot forth his head and arm at the foresaid window, and heard his majesty crying loudly, 'Fy, treason! treason!' and 'Murder! Help, Earl of Mar!' whereupon, I being very aghast and wonderfully astonished at that cruel and terrible sight, and pitiful and woful cry—I not knowing what the matter meant, but perceiving his majesty in extreme and great danger, ran with all possible diligence through the streets, crying loudly, 'Fy, treason! treason against the king! For God's sake, all honest men haste and release the king!' and commanded to ring the common bell, that all men might come in haste to his majesty's relief. And then I returned with all possible diligence, with ane great number of the people with me, and came before the foresaid turret and window where I saw his majesty first cry out, and then I cried out, 'How is the king?' but my lord duke and my Lord of Mar answered, 'The king is well, praised be God!' Then I cried up to his majesty, and show him that the bailies and township was there come in all haste to supply and relieve his majesty; and therefore besought his majesty to command what was his majesty's will, and best to be done. And then his majesty beckoned forth his hand to me and to the people, commanding me to cause the people retire them to their lodging." And this the bailie declared that he accomplished.

Among other and secondary details, the porter at Gowrie gate confirmed the account of the false story that the king had gone, and gave it special emphasis. The Duke of Lennox asked him if the king had passed forth. He answered that he had not. Mar pressed him, "Tell me of verity if his majesty be forth;" and the answer was, "In truth he is not forth." Then he says: "The Earl of Gowrie, looking with ane angry countenance, said, 'Thou lied; he is furth at the back yett and through the Inch.'" To this the porter made answer, "That cannot be, my

lord, for I have the key of the back yett, and of all the yetts of the place." He then described like the others the scene at the window.

At the door of the turret chamber Graham of Balgowan found a garter in the "bent" or sea-rushes strewn on the floor, according to the practice anterior to carpeting. Hearing that Alexander Ruthven had striven to tie the king's hands with a garter, he showed this to the king, who recognised it as the garter he had seen in Ruthven's hands. On that it seems Sir Thomas Erskine "gripped" the garter, and said he would keep it, "whilk he has yet in keeping," as Graham concludes.

When the testimony of those who had witnessed the scene at the turret window, and of those who took part in the affairs inside the house, had been taken, there still remained one essential witness unfound—the mysterious man in armour who stood in the turret chamber. After an offer of pardon and reward to him if he would reveal himself, he came forward, and proved to be Andrew Henderson, the Earl of Gowrie's chamberlain over his domain of Scone. He was a man of sufficient importance to be individualised by royalty; for the king, when his name was mentioned, said, using a slang expression of the day, that he knew "that smaik." We have already had his account of the scene in the turret. His story has otherwise some curious little particulars which fit into the minor incidents noticed by other witnesses. He said that on the evening before, the earl had asked him what he was to be about next morning. He said he had to go to Ruthven about some matter with the tenants. The earl bade him stay that journey and attend the Master to Falkland. The Master, Andrew Ruthven, and he rode to Falkland accordingly. The other two went into a house, and Henderson was instructed to observe the king's motions. When the king was visible, he announced this to the Master. He saw the interview, and observed that "the king laid his hand on his shoulder and clapped him, where they spake together by the space of ane quarter of an hour." After the second interview, Henderson was sent to Perth. He was desired by the Master to

hasten, "as he loved the Lord Gowrie's and his honour, and advertise his brother that his majesty will be there with a few number incontinent, and cause make his dinner ready." When he reached Gowrie House, and delivered his message, the earl questioned him keenly and anxiously about the reception which the Master had met, and about the number and quality of the people with the king.

The earl then told him to put on "his secret and plate sleeves," because there was a Highlandman to be taken "in the Shoegate." When the earl and his following went out to meet the king, Henderson thought their purpose was the seizure of the Highlander, so he added his steel bonnet and gauntlets to his other armour. The shape in which he put this supposed purpose is curious. When he heard "the noise of their forthgoing," he supposed they "were going to make breeks for Maconnil Dhui." We thus not only know the name of the Highlander likely to be found in the Shoegate, but we have the Perth citizen's familiar way of treating the fettering of a Highlander. It was by putting breeks or breeches on him—a playful allusion, no doubt, to the known deficiency of his race in this garment. Maconnil Dhui would not be alone; and hence, when a concourse issued from Gowrie House, it was presumed that their purpose was to seize him. Seeing that their purpose was different, Henderson sent his steel bonnet away. This steel bonnet he afterwards recognised on the earl's head; and we have seen how another witness said that a steel bonnet was put on the earl's head by one of his people.

After this, Henderson was told by the earl to put himself at the disposal of the Master, who took him to the turret chamber and locked him in it. He said that when left alone a dread of some evil overcame him, and he kneeled and prayed to God. After the scene he described, he managed to slip out and go quietly home, speaking to no one, save that he told his wife that but for his presence the king had been twice stabbed. He seems to have been a person of calm and reflective character; for he says in conclusion, that he "passed to

the bridge, and walked up and down by the space of an hour.”¹

While the Gowrie Conspiracy is peculiar in the closeness and clearness that its external history can be traced with, it is equally remarkable for the profound mystery shrouding the ultimate object of those concerned in it. Some trace we shall find of the probable farther stages of the design, but nothing to explain the political object to be ultimately achieved. Years passed, indeed, before traces could be found that any human being knew what was to be done, save the two brothers who had been sent into eternal silence. Appropriate to this isolation of the conspirators, a story got circulation, which is thus told by Archbishop Spottiswood:—

“I remember myself, that meeting with Mr William Couper, then minister at Perth, the third day after, at Falkland, he showed me that, not many days before that accident, visiting by occasion the earl at his own house, he found him reading a book, ‘De Conjurat[i]onibus adversus Principes;’ and having asked him what a book it was, he answered that it was a collection of the conspira-

¹ It is surely to be much regretted that the picturesque old house rendered memorable by the Gowrie Conspiracy has been removed to leave a site for uninteresting city improvements. Pennant tells us, that in his day (now just a century ago) “Gowrie House is shown to all strangers—formerly the property and residence of the Earl of Gowrie, whose tragical end and mysterious conspiracy—if conspiracy there was—are still fresh in the minds of the people of Perth. At present the house is occupied by some companies of artillery. I was shown the staircase where the unhappy nobleman was killed, the window that frightened monarch James roared out of, and that he escaped through when he was saved from the fury of the populace by Bailey Roy, a friend of Gowrie’s, who was extremely beloved in the town.”—*Journal*, i. 89. The house became naturally an object of superstitious awe. It is told how, “upon the Sabbath-day, the tenth, which was the Sabbath after the murder, there were seen in the lodgings where the fact was committed men opening and closing the windows with great flashing, coming to the windows, looking over, and wringing their hands; and the day following, such mourning heard that the people about were terrified.”—*Calderwood*, vi. 49. Stories somewhat like this were told of the Hôtel de Guise on the night of the massacre of St Bartholomew, and of the mansion of the Hamiltons at the Kirk-of-Field on the night of Darnley’s murder.

cies made against princes, which he said were foolishly contrived all of them, and faulty either in one point or other; for he that goeth about such a business should not, said he, put any man in his counsel. And he not liking such discourse, desired him to lay away such books, and read others of a better subject.”¹

William Rynd, who had been the family tutor, was pressed hard on any words that might have dropped from the earl “anent the duty of a wise man in the execution of ane high enterprise.” He said, whether to propitiate the questioners or not, that the earl “was ever of that opinion that he was not a wise man that, having intended the execution of ane high and dangerous purpose, communicated the same to any but to himself; because

¹ Spottiswood, 461. No one apparently has succeeded in finding a book with the title ‘De Conjuracionibus adversus Principes.’ There might be a question whether the book meant was that written by Theodore Beza, with the title ‘Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos; sive de Principis in Populum, Populique in Principem, legitima potestate. Stephano Junio Bruto Celta, auctore,’ of which an edition was printed in Edinburgh in 1579. A search through this book was not rewarded by the discovery of a passage answering to Gowrie’s description. The next point was to remember that this book was an answer to Macchiavelli’s celebrated treatise ‘De Officio Principis.’ The two are so closely connected that they are often bound up together. I possess them thus together in old binding. There might have been a confusion in the words of Gowrie himself between the two sides of the controversy, or in the memory either of the parish minister or Spottiswood. The following passage by Macchiavelli may possibly be the one referred to: “Conjuratorum enim quæ sibi imminere difficultates, penè infinitæ sunt. Re ipsa profecto cernitur, multos quidem conjurasse: quibus verò feliciter cesserit, perpauci admodum fuerunt. Qui enim conjurat, nec solus esse, nec socium sibi asciscere potest, nisi ex iis, quos offensos existimat. Verum ubi primum offenso cuiquam animi tui consilium aperueris, facultatem concedis, qua sibi cumulatè satis fieri possit: quando quidem detecto animi tui cogitato, in eam ipse spem venit, ut omnia sibi inde comoda polliceri queat. Hic itaque quæstum ratum et certum cum videat, illic verò incertum, et periculis plenum, par est, ut aut rarus sit amicus, aut quo tibi fidem servet, pervicaci odio in principem sit affectus.”—P. 102, 103. Lord Hailes thinks another book by Macchiavelli to have been the one: “From the title and contents of this book, I am much inclined to think that it was the Latin translation of Macchiavelli’s discourse on Livy, book iii. c. 6.”

keeping it himself, it could not be discovered or disappointed."

Some mysterious vestiges of magic or sorcery added their dread influence to the strange tragedy. The Ruthven family had an evil reputation as dealers with the black arts. The earl himself was a scholar who had dwelt much in foreign countries, attending universities where such unlawful studies were believed to be pursued without restraint.¹ Dealings in sorcery, necromancy, witchcraft, and magic were the grand accusation which left the accused no hope; for he was immediately the object of a terror, abhorrence, and hatred which disturbed all attempts to weigh the question of guilt or innocence. When the earl's clothes were searched after his death, nothing else was found in them, according to the king's statement, "but a little close parchment bag full of magical characters and words of enchantment." As to these, according to the same account, it was observed, "that while they were upon him, his wound whereof he died bled not; but incontinent after the taking of them away, the blood gushed out in great abundance, to the great admiration of all the beholders, an infamy which hath spotted the race of this house for many descents, as is notoriously known to the whole country." It was an obvious inference, that the bleeding might have been caused by the handling of the body, or the removal of any portion of clothes acting as a cincture. The poor tutor was much questioned about the "magical characters," as he admitted that he had seen them at Padua. The earl had given irritable answers when questions were asked about them, and acted as if he felt their safe possession of the utmost moment. He seems to have dealt in a pursuit fashionable among the students of the age—the mystical combinations of letters,

¹ Queen Elizabeth wrote a letter of congratulation to King James, making some lively remarks on Gowrie's connection with the powers of darkness: "When they say that he had a thousand spirits his familiars, I suppose none were left in hell, so many were in the earth; and therefore ye may joy the more that God doth the better defend thee, that no infernal power bears any sway when a higher force make defence."—Rolls House, MSS. (Scotland), lxvi. 19.

forms, and arithmetical calculations, to which the old doctrine of the cabala had degenerated.¹

For all the horror thus conjured up, there was a strong party in the country who leaned to the doctrine that the house of Gowrie had got foul play. They had been a great power in the State. They were the immediate rulers over a broad domain, covering central Scotland from Ruthven on the Spey almost as far south as the Forth. The earl was Provost of the city of Perth, and hence the feudal protector of its burgesses. The family represented the leading influence among the Protestant lords of the Raid of Ruthven, and were thus the hereditary leaders of the Presbyterian party—their stay and support. It served to nourish suspicions for a time, that the only two persons to whom the king's party could point as connected in any way—even the slightest—with a plot against the king, had both been put to death before they could say a word for themselves. But their death was inevitable, if it were practicable. The small group in the turret, surrounded as they appeared to be by enemies, were in the position where self-preservation is naturally sought in the death of each assailant; and as King James afterwards naturally enough said, he had neither God nor the devil before him.

The theory that the whole was a plot of the Court to ruin the powerful house of Gowrie, must at once, after a calm weighing of the evidence, be dismissed as beyond the range of sane conclusions. Those who formed it had to put one of the very last men in the world to accept of such a destiny, into the position of an unarmed man, who, without any preparation, was to render himself into the hands of his armed adversaries, and cause a succession of surprises and acts of violence, which by his own courage and dexterity he would rule to a definite and preconcerted end. No trace could ever be found of preparation for

¹ One of the clergy, Patrick Galloway, in a celebration sermon, pithily summed up the tenor of these revelations, in saying that the earl "was an atheist, an incarnate devil, a studier of magic, a conjurer with devils, some of whom he had under his command."

such an enterprise; and its advocates have had to plead for it on such petty items of evidence as that the king's acquaintance with the structure of Gowrie House was shown when he corrected Henderson about the proper window he should open. It shows, however, how deep a root this view had taken in the county where the Ruthvens held rule, that within the present century Perth has produced three books, written to prove that the Gowrie Conspiracy was planned by King James for the ruin of the house of Gowrie.¹

Before turning to light thrown on this affair some years afterwards, let us see how it was received at the time. An attempt upon its face so resolute, and yet so absolutely isolated, casting neither root nor branch into the ordinary political powers at work in its day, was very perplexing. It could not be traced to Popery or Presbyterian fanaticism—to England or to France. By English statesmen, indeed, it was treated in some measure as a calamitous accident,—King James and his assistants had taken panic at something, and acted the part of desperate men. At home, especially among the Presbyterian clergy, there was a conflict of opinions.

On the 11th of August the king crossed the Forth and landed at Leith. “It was remarked that there was ebbing and flowing three times at that tide; that the water betwixt Leith and Burntisland was blackish; that the

¹ A Dissertation on that Portion of Scottish History termed the Gowrie Conspiracy; in which an Attempt is made to point out, in a satisfactory manner, the Causes of the Catastrophe which took place at Perth on the 5th of August 1600. By William Panton. Perth, 1812.

A History of the Life and Death of John, Earl of Gowrie, with preliminary Dissertations. By the Rev. James Scott. 1818.

Memorabilia of the City of Perth. 1806.

It may be noted that these provincial efforts have found companionship in literature of a totally different order. The Gowrie Conspiracy has presented irresistible attractions to the gifted persons whose eagle vision pierces at a glance through the fogs of doubt and difficulty that interrupt the plodding investigator. Hence we have the fortune to possess some astounding historical portraits presenting us with our old grotesque friend King James in the united character of Macchiavelli, Mephistopheles, and Domitian.

ships in Leith harbour were troubled with the swelling of the water. A great noise of shot of cannon and hackbuts was at his landing, as if he had been new born.”¹ He was met by an armed guard of the citizens of Edinburgh. David Lindsay, the minister, took him to the kirk of Leith, and improved the opportunity of thankfulness for the great deliverance, to exhort him “to perform his vow made of beforetimes of performance of justice.” “At which words,” we are told, “he smiled and talked with those that were about him, after his unreverend manner of behaviour at sermons.”

A more solemn thanksgiving service awaited him in Edinburgh. The market-cross being covered with tapestry, the king took his seat there; and Patrick Galloway preached to the assembled citizens from the 124th Psalm, beginning, “David the king composed this psalm after he had been freed from the great danger of his deadly enemies:” “The like cause we have in hand presently. Our king, our David, our anointed, has been in danger deadly, and is delivered—praised be God.” The sermon must have been exciting, for it contained in pretty distinct terms the king’s narrative of the affair, decorated with touches of eloquence, as, for instance: “Now judge ye, good people, what danger your David was in when, as an innocent lamb, he was closed up betwixt twa hungry lions thirsting for his blood, and four locks betwixt him and his friends and his servants, so that they might neither hear nor hearken him. This was his danger; but what sort of delivery gat he? It was wholly miraculous; altogether to be ascribed to God, and no part to man.” Of Gowrie he said: “Let nane think that by this traitorous fact of his our religion has received any blot; for ane of our religion was he not, but a deep dissimulate hypocrite, ane profound atheist, ane incarnat devil in the coat of an angel, as is maist evident, baith by the traitorous fact whilk he had attempted, and also by sundry other things whilk we have received by his familiars and the maist dear and near of his friends; as the books whilk he used, whilk

¹ Calderwood, vi. 50.

proves him plainly to be ane studier of magic, and a conjurer of devils, and to have had so many at his command. His manner of living out of the country, in haunting with Papists—yea, the Pope himself, with whom he had not conference only, but farther has made covenant.”¹

Some other of the Presbyterian clergy were not so confiding and loyal. An edict was issued against five of them—Robert Bruce, Walter Balcanquhall, James Balfour, William Watson, and John Hall. They had been charged to assemble their several flocks “in their ain kirks, and there publicly to have intimated to them the said treason, and to have given thanks to God for the said delivery of his majesty’s person.” They did not do so; and being plied with argument and testimony, they still maintained a silence implying a provoking suspiciousness as to the

¹ “Discourse of Psalm cxxiv., by Mr Patrick Galloway, one of the ministers of the king’s household;” Bannatyne Miscellany, i. 141. Galloway was to the more zealous of his brethren a fallen star—one who had bartered Christ and the Kirk for Court favour. He had struggled so vehemently against Lennox and Arran, denouncing them from the pulpit, that he had to seek safety in England. See “The Apology for Mr Patrick Galloway, minister at Perth, when he fled to England, May 11, 1584;” *ibid.*, 107. Montgomery the poet said of him :—

“Sound, Galloway, the trumpet of the Lord,
The blessed brethren shall obey thy blast;
Then thunder out the threatenings of the Word
Against the wicked that away are cast.”

The insinuation of Popery against Gowrie was thoroughly groundless. In a letter written from Padua to his brother in 1595, he mentions with thorough Protestant horror and wrath the cruelties committed at the instigation of the Jesuits. The fate of their martyrs was certainly not unprovoked: “Ane certain Englishman, being moved in zeal to cast their *sacra hostia* (as they most falsely call it) out of the priest’s hands that was carrying it in procession, to the ground, and to stamp on it with his feet, was apprehended and denuded of his clothes, thereafter ane hood put on his head, whereon was painted the devil’s image, and some with blazes, who brunt him continually on the back and breast as he walked forward; but he in the mean time was occupied in showing the people how they were shamefully abused by these nuisent idolaters who were leading them to their own damnation.” “All these things were done in Rome, that mother of all vice, and hoorishe synagog of devils.”—*Ibid.*, 134.

truth of the whole story. They were ordered to leave the town, and not to appear within twelve miles of it.¹

Foremost among these sceptics was he who bore the illustrious name of Robert Bruce. He was one of the Bruces of Airth—the family claiming the nearest descent of any of that name to the blood-royal. King James was peculiarly haunted by that weakness which urges men to press a vindication of their conduct on the sceptical and unreasonable, and he only made the position more ludicrous and unpleasant by his desperate and hopeless efforts to break the obstinacy of Bruce and those who stood by him. After long bickering, there came a scene such as any abridgment would despoil of its picturesqueness: “The king asked at last, ‘Now, are ye yet persuaded? Ye have heard me, ye have heard my minister, ye have heard my Counsel, ye have heard the Earl of Mar, touching the report of this treason; whether are ye yet fully persuaded or not?’ ‘Surely, sir,’ says Mr Robert, ‘I would have further light before I preached it to persuade the people. If I were but a private subject, not a pastor, I could rest upon your majesty’s report as others do.’ Then the king asked Mr James Balfour, ‘Are ye fully persuaded?’ He answered, ‘I will speak nothing to the contrary, sir.’ ‘But are ye not persuaded?’ says the king. ‘Not yet, sir,’ said he. Mr William Watson answered after the same manner. Mr Walter Balcanquhall said that he would affirm all that Mr David Lindesay preached in pulpit in presence of his majesty yesterday. ‘What said Mr David?’ says the king. ‘Mr David founded himself upon your majesty’s report, and made a faithful rehearsal of your report; and so shall we.’ ‘Think ye,’ says the king, ‘that Mr David doubted of my report?’ Mr David was sent for incontinent. They said unto him, ‘Are ye not certainly persuaded of this treason?’ ‘Yes, sir,’ says he; ‘I am persuaded in conscience of it.’ ‘Now,’ says the king, ‘Mr Walter, are ye freely persuaded?’ ‘Indeed, sir,’ says he, ‘I would have farther time and light.’ Then the king asked at Mr John Hall,

¹ Pitcairn, ii. 234.

‘Are ye fully persuaded?’ He answered, ‘I would have the civil trial going before, sir, that I may be persuaded.’ Then the king asked at Mr Peter Hewat. ‘Mr Peter, whether are ye yet persuaded or not?’ ‘Sir,’ says he, ‘I suspect not your proclamation.’ ‘But whether believe ye it or not?’ says the king. ‘The president heard,’ said he, ‘what I said the last Sabbath.’ The president began to justify him, but the king insisted, saying, ‘Let me hear himself. Whether believe ye my proclamation or not?’ says the king. ‘Sir,’ says he, ‘I believe it.’ So they were all removed.”¹

To the end only of drawing forth more vexatious and troublesome stuff, the king would have a second communing with Mr Robert, and again a third. In the second, when they had got into the thick of the controversy, the king referred to his sending Sir Thomas Erskine to satisfy the obdurate minister about the facts, but the satisfaction was incomplete: “‘As for Sir Thomas Erskine,’ said Mr Robert, ‘I trusted him in a part; but there were other things that I thought hard.’ ‘What was that?’ said the king. ‘That part which concerned the Master of Gowrie and your majesty,’ said Mr Robert. ‘Doubt ye of that?’ said the king. ‘Then you could not but count me a murderer.’ ‘It followeth not, if it please you, sir,’ said Mr Robert; ‘for ye might have some secret cause.’ The king deduced the whole tragedy from the beginning. Mr Robert uttered his doubt where he found occasion. The king heard him gently, and with a constant countenance, which Mr Robert admired. At last the king urgeth him to preach the articles which were sent to him. Mr Robert answered, he had given his answer already to these articles; and had offered to the ambassadors that which all men thought satisfaction, yea, more than preaching. ‘What is that?’ said the king. ‘That I will subscribe my resolution,’ said Mr Robert. ‘Trust you it?’ said the king. ‘Yes, sir,’ said Mr Robert. ‘If ye trust it, why may ye not preach it?’ said the king. ‘I shall tell you, sir,’ said Mr Robert: ‘I give it but a doubtful trust;

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, ii. 300, 301.

for I learn this out of Bernard—in doubtful things to give undoubted trust is temerity, and in undoubted things to give a doubtful trust is infirmity.’ ‘But this is undoubted,’ said the king. ‘Then bear with my infirmity,’ said Mr Robert. ‘But ye say it is more than preaching?’ said the king. ‘Sir, I ought to preach nothing but the Word of God,’ said Mr Robert. ‘Obedience to princes, suppose they were wicked, is the Word of God,’ said the king. ‘I durst lay a wager there is no express word of King James the Sixth in the Scripture.’ ‘Yes,’ said Mr Robert; ‘if there be a king there, there is word for you also.’”¹

At the third conference he still has not light to announce from the pulpit what is wanted: “‘Are you resolved to preach?’ said the king. ‘I am discharged to preach the pleasures of men,’ says Mr Robert. ‘Place me where God placed me, and I shall teach fruitful doctrine as God shall give me grace. But we have not that custom to be enjoined to preach, nor I dare not promise to keep that injunction. It lyeth not in my hand to make a promise. I know not certainly what God may suffer me to speak. I may stand dumb. Therefore, sir, leave me free, and when I shall find myself moved by God’s Spirit, and to have the warrant of His Word, I shall not fail to do it.’ ‘That is plain Anibaptistry—that is cabal and tradition,’ said the king. ‘Ye shall preach as the rest have done, or else I cannot be satisfied—ye shall go.’”

But the king would not let him go without another effort. It succeeded only in drawing from Mr Robert the reason for his doubts, and these were not of a character to gratify the king: “The king urgeth him the more earnestly, and saith, ‘I will not only have you clearing me, but my whole company.’ ‘As for your majesty’s company,’ says Mr Robert, ‘they have no need of my clearing, neither will they seek it. I am bound to your majesty, and I will do all that lyeth in my possibility.’ ‘Then ye must subscribe my innocence,’ said the king. ‘Your own conscience, sir, can do that best,’ said Mr Robert. ‘It

¹ Pitcairn’s Criminal Trials, ii. 305.

is very hard for me to do it.' 'Why is it hard?' said the king. Loth was Mr Robert to answer, least he should irritate him, but he insisted. Then said Mr R., 'Your majesty will not be offended if I speak freely?' 'Not,' said the king. 'I was reading,' said Mr Robert, 'upon Amandus Polanus, touching the slaughter of the magicians, when the King of Babel commanded to slay. Amandus disputeth the question whether the King of Babel did well or not. First, he saith, *animi gratia*, it would appear that he did well, for he had the plain law of God for him in many places; yet he concludes against the king that he did not well, for, howsoever he had the law, yet he looked not to the law, nor had regard to God nor His glory: therefore, saith he, howsoever the magistrate hath the sword and may most justly execute, yet if he have nothing but his own particular before his eyes—God nor His glory—he is a murtherer. Now, sir, I pray, what can I or any man say what your majesty had before your eyes? or what particular ye had?' 'It is true,' saith the king; 'and therefore I will give you leave to pose me upon the particulars.' 'Then, first, if it please you,' said Mr Robert, 'had ye a purpose to slay my lord?' 'As I shall answer to God,' saith the king, 'I knew not that my lord was slain till I saw him in his last agony, and was very sorry, yea, prayed in my heart for the same.' 'What say ye, then, concerning Mr Alexander?' said Mr Robert. 'I grant,' said the king, 'I am art and part of Mr Alexander's slaughter, for it was in my own defence.' 'Why brought ye him not to justice,' said Mr Robert, 'seeing ye would have had God before your eyes?' 'I had neither God nor the devil, man, before my eyes,' said the king, 'but my own defence.' Here the king began to fret. He took all these points 'upon his salvation and damnation,' and that he 'was ance minded to have spared Mr Alexander; but being moved for the time, the motion prevailed.' Farther, Mr Robert demanded of the king if he had a purpose that day, in the morning, to slay Mr Alexander? The king answered, upon his salvation, that day in the morning he loved him as his brother. Mr Robert by reason of his oaths, thought him innocent of

any purpose that day, in the morning to slay them ; yet, because he confessed he had not God nor justice before his eyes, but was in a heat and mind unto wrong, he could not be innocent before God, and had great cause to repent, and to crave mercy for Christ's sake."¹

It was another item in the mysteries or enigmas of this strange affair, that the easy, good-natured monarch was at once possessed by an indiscriminate ferocity against the young members of the house of Gowrie. There were two younger brothers of the slain men, both boys at school, and seven sisters. Of these the eldest, Margaret, was mother of the renowned Marquess of Montrose. Nicolson, the English ambassador in Scotland, writing to Cecil, says: "The king at his return to Falkland presently caused thrust out of the house from the queen, Gowrie's two sisters—in chief credit with the queen—and swears to root out that whole house and name." The two boys with difficulty escaped to Berwick.² The commander there was Sir John Carey, one of Queen Elizabeth's cousins of the Hunsdon family. As the name is somewhat connected with a body of greedy adventurers, it is pleasant to find traces of courage and humanity in one of the tribe. He writes to inform Cecil that "the king has made great search and lays great wait for the two younger brothers, who by great fortune escaped from the schools ; and not daring to tarry in Scotland, they have this day come into Berwick closely in disguised apparel. And being brought to me, they only desire that their lives may be safe, and they may have a little oversight here till the truth of their cause may be known ; and the pitiful case of the old distressed good countess hath made me the willinglier give my consent for their stay here a while till I may by your honourable means know the queen's majesty's pleasure."³

Carey writes again that he had not seen the poor boys, "so close have they kept themselves as they have never yet stirred out of their chamber which they first entered

¹ Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, ii. 305.

² Ibid., 314.

³ Secret Correspondence of Cecil, 161.

into, to look abroad." Carey desired that for their greater safety they should seek a retreat farther from the Border. They were detained, however, in their hiding-place at Berwick, by want of clothing and money for a journey. The result was well, for Carey thought if they had moved they would have been trapped. He gives a formidable picture of the power at the command of him who was expected soon to be King of Britain, even on that side of the Border which was not yet his. The mother of the boys could find no messenger to convey assistance to them: "Such secret search and privy spial is there through the whole country for her and her sons, as no friend either dare or can travel between them; such privy search is laid for them in all places, as almost no man can travel in their country but he is searched. And if I had sent them sooner away, I should but have sent them to very great danger, either of being killed or taken; for that they being very poor themselves, and having no friends nor any acquaintance, could neither have told whether to have gone nor what to do."¹

It was not until eight years afterwards, when King James had been five years quietly seated on the throne of England, that this affair could properly receive the name of conspiracy, by evidence that the plan of it was prearranged, and that others had taken part in it besides the two slain brothers. The incidents which brought to light one side of a correspondence between the brothers and Robert Logan, the Laird of Restalrig, near Edinburgh, will have afterwards to be told; in the mean time we have merely to deal with these revelations. As these come forth, it may be well to keep in mind that the two Ruthvens were young men—the earl twenty-four and the Master nineteen years old—and that they had vast power. Seizing upon or kidnapping a king had in that day become almost a constitutional method of effecting a change of ministry in Scotland. The father of the young men had effective possession of King James, and the madcap Bothwell had very nearly accomplished the same good fortune.

¹ Secret Correspondence of Cecil, 165.

Then they had the death of their father to avenge in an age when vengeance was usurped by men, and became a duty: it was said that gratitude for their restoration should have cancelled the injury to be avenged; but, as we have seen, their gratitude was not earned by the king.¹

The letters are all on one side—viz., Logan's—and include some addressed to persons unknown as well as to the Ruthvens. He reminds his correspondent more than once to deal with his letters after this manner: "Deliver it to the bearer again, that I may see it burnt with my own ein, as I have sent your lordship's letter to your lordship again; for so is the fashion, I grant." There are abundance of other indications that their intercourse is of a kind extremely perilous. "I doubt not," he says, "but ye know the peril to be baith life, land, and honour, in case the matter be not wisely used; and for my own part, I shall have ane special respect to my promise that I have made to his lordship, and Mr Alexander, his lordship's brother, although the skaffold were set up." It seems that the Ruthvens thought Logan's brother-in-law, Lord Home, would be a serviceable coadjutor; but Logan thought otherwise, saying of him, "In good faith, he will never help his friend nor harm his foe." "For God's sake, let neither any knowledge come to my lord my brother's ears, nor yet to Mr William Rynd,* my lord's old pedagogue; for my brother is kittle to shoe behind, and dare not enterprise for fear, and the other will dissuade us from our purpose with reasons of religion, whilk I can never abide." In contrast to this brother he repeatedly mentions a coadjutor of humbler rank called Laird Bower, an old man who carried their letters: "Your lordship may confide

¹ There are traces of those who were instruments in his father's fate dreading vengeance on Gowrie's return. James Hudson writes to Cecil about a Colonel Stewart, "valiant and of good experience," who has gone to Ireland and desires employment: "His service was mostly in the Low Countries. The true grounds of his intended travel is, that he doubts that this Earl of Gowrie will think of his father's death, because he took him in the tyrant James Stewart's time, who called himself Earl of Arran."—Rolls House, MSS. (Scotland), lxvi. 43.

mair in this auld man, the bearer hereof, nor on my brother; for I lippen my life and all I have else in his hands, and I trow he would not spare to ride to hell's gate to pleasure me."

Of Laird Bower's capacity Logan repeatedly speaks slightlying, while expressing entire trust in his fidelity. When the critical time approaches he says: "Always I repose on your advertisement of the precise day with credit to the bearer; for howbeit he be but ane silly auld gleyed carle, I will answer for him that he shall be very true." And another time he gives assurance of him as one "to whom you may credit all your heart," for he is "wonder honest;" "for an it were my own soul, I durst make him messenger thereof, I have such experience of his truth in many other things." It may be observed in passing, that on the ample papers in which the history of the conspiracy is to be found, there is no other notice of this miracle of a subordinate conspirator besides these testimonials of his master to his merits, nor is there any trace that inquiry was made about him. Before coming closer to the shape in which Logan and the Ruthvens were to co-operate, we may dispose of a separate item—the reward to be reaped by Logan. It was the barony of Dirleton, in East Lothian, inherited by the Ruthven family as heirs of the Haliburtons. Logan made no secret of his delight in the prospect of this possession. "I care naught," he says, "for all the land I have in this kingdom, in case I get a grip of Dirleton; for I esteem it the pleasantest dwelling in Scotland." And those who have seen the remains of its old Edwardian castle overlooking the Firth of Forth will not condemn his preference.

Let us now see how these letters point to the project in view. We have seen that in the excited talk with the king in the turret the Master spoke of revenging his father's death. Logan spoke distinctly more than once of this object. In one passage, calling him by a name which had been applied to more than one popular leader in Scotland, he says: "I think there is nane of a noble heart, and carries a stomach worth a penny, but they wald be glad to see ane contented revenge of Grey Steil's deid"

or death. In a letter to the earl he speaks of the great danger incurred by all as a thing to be worthily paid for vengeance: "I beseek your lordship, baith for the safety of your honour, credit, and more nor that, your life, my life, and the lives of many others wha may perhaps innocently smart for that turn afterwards, in case it be revealed by any, and likewise the utter wrecking of our lands and houses, and extirpating of our names,—look that we be all as sure as your lordship, and I myself shall be for my own part; and then I doubt not but by God's grace we shall bring our matter till ane fine, whilk shall bring contentment to us all that ever wished for the revenge of the Machiavelliant massacring of our dearest friends." At one point, where he gets into a hilarious mood, Logan notes with curious distinctness the man who was to be the victim, the opportunity, and the time. The 5th of August is the date of the events in Gowrie House; the letter dates on the 29th of July which carries this passage: "In case God grant ane happy success in this errand, I hope baith to have your lordship and his lordship, with many others of your lovers and his, at a good dinner before I die. Always I hope that the king's buck-hunting at Falkland this year shall prepare some dainty cheer for us against that dinner the next year. *Hoc jocosè* to animate your lordship at this time, but afterwards ye shall have better occasion to make merry. I protest, my lord, before God, I wish nothing with a better heart nor to achieve that whilk your lordship would fain attain unto, and my continual prayer shall tend to that effect; and with the large spending of my lands, goods—yea, the hazard of my life shall naught affray me fra that, although the skaffold were already set up, before I should falsify my promise to your lordship."

Let us now try what help these letters give towards a knowledge of the plans of the conspirators. There is repeated reference to Logan's stronghold of Fast Castle, on a rock near the southern entrance of the Firth of Forth. The first reference to this place is in a letter sent from the castle itself, and dated the 18th of July, of which the closing words are: "Use all expedition, for the time will

not be long delayed.¹ Ye know the king's hunting will be shortly, and then shall be best time, as Mr Alexander Ruthven has assured me that my lord has resolved to enterprise that matter. Looking for your answer, commits you to Christ's holy protection.—From Fast Castle the aughteenth day of July 1600.”

What was to be done at Fast Castle is told in terms which invite close criticism: “Always to the purpose I think best for our plot that we meet all at my house of Fast Castle, for I have concluded with Mr Alexander Ruthven how I think it shall be metest to be conveyed quietest in ane boat by sea.” This was written to the unknown partner in the project. Two days later, on the 29th of July, we find him writing to the earl: “I doubt not but Mr Alexander, your brother, has informed your lordship what course I laid down to bring all your lordship's associates to my house of Fast Castle by sea, where I should have all materials in readiness for their safe receiving a land and into my house; making, as it were, but a manner of passing time in ane boat on the sea in this fair summer-tide; and none other strangers to haunt my house quhile we had concluded on the laying of our plot, which is already devised by Mr Alexander and me. And I would wish that your lordship would either come or send Mr Alexander to me, and thereafter I would meet your lordship in Leith, or quietly at Restalrig, where we should have prepared ane fine hatted kit with sugar comfits and wine, and thereafter confer on matters—and the sooner we brought our purpose to pass it were the better before harvest. Let not Mr W. R., your auld pedagogue, ken of your coming; but rather would I, if I durst be so bold, to entreat your lordship once to come and see my own house, where I have kepted my Lord Bothwell in his greatest extremity—say the king and his Counsel what they would.” The next allusion to Fast Castle is in a letter of the last day of July to the unknown. After one of the many commendations on the honesty of Laird Bower, there comes: “He has reported to me his lord-

¹ “Will not” is here used in the Scots sense of “must not.”

ship's own answer. I think all matters shall be concluded at my house at Fast Castle; for I and Mr Alexander Ruthven concluded that ye would come with him and his lordship, and only ane other man with you, being but only four in company, intil ane of the great fishing-boats by sea to my house, where ye shall land as safely as on Leith shore—and the house against his lordship's coming to be quiet; and when ye are about half a mile from shore, as it were passing by the house, to gar set forth ane waff"—that is to say, a signal.¹

From the earlier of these passages it might be supposed that the conspiracy they refer to was to be hatched at Fast Castle, and that the selection of so remote and inaccessible a place was owing to the large assemblage who were to meet. The passage last cited, however, shows that there were only to be six persons there—Logan himself and Laird Bower, with the four who were to come in the boat: the house was to be "quiet," without other guests. These persons—the three active ones among them, at all events—might have met anywhere and concocted what they pleased without exciting notice; indeed Logan suggested a meeting at his suburban house at Restalrig, where they were to partake of "hatted kit"—a mixture somewhat like sillabub—and make an excursion along the east coast, that Gowrie might see how well Fast Castle would suit their great purpose. One of the four was the unknown correspondent. He is called "right honourable sir." He was at large in Scotland, and in all respects evidently the kind of person that Gowrie or any other might meet at any time without suspicion of treason. The person, therefore, whose presence rendered the choice of a spot remote and inaccessible was clearly the "other man," who was to have been the fourth in the boat.

Any one who has read these passages will be in some

¹ See the letters printed by Mr Pitcairn, who discovered the originals among the warrants of Parliament in the General Register House; Criminal Trials, ii. 281 *et seq.* The letter of the 18th of July may be seen in Part III. of "Fac-similes of National Manuscripts of Scotland," selected under the direction of the Lord Clerk Register.

measure able to give his own answer to this last and critical question, Was this "other man" to be King James?

If it was, the project was a more skilful one than first appearances suggest. If the great folly of kidnapping the king was to be attempted, the plan was well laid. An attempt to seduce him into any lonely castle on the sea-shore would have had little chance of success. Gowrie House was close to, almost within, a considerable town; and that it had a river close by might pass unnoticed, though that river was the very thing that made the place dangerous. The largeness of the attendance on the king seems to have disconcerted the project. But if the two brothers could have sent them scattering over the Inch, and taken the king, tied and gagged, to a boat, they could have floated down in a few minutes into broad waters, and had the way clear before them for Fast Castle. It is significant that James avoided the dangers of the Perth mob by taking boat—perhaps the same boat that was intended for removing him in another fashion.

That grim stronghold, so well known from Scott's 'Bride of Lammermoor,' was signally well adapted for such an enterprise. Though it overlooks the trade of the German Ocean, it belongs to a coast terrible to the mariner, who keeps a wide offing from it. On the land side the entrance to it is difficult, and some have thought it dangerous even when they have not had to expect an enemy within. There was then, and indeed there still is, a broad tract of desolate land separating it from the nearest habitations.

If we suppose it clear, or likely at least, that King James was to be taken to that lonely strength, it is, as already said, an absolute mystery how he was to be treated when he was there.

It is possible that Italian story or history might support or contradict this supposition. The Master had, it seems, a story about a nobleman of Padua so exactly the same in its events as the part the conspirators were going to play, that Logan spoke of it with somewhat of a shudder. "In case," he says, writing to the unknown, "you and Mr Alexander Ruthven forgather, because he is somewhat conceitly, for God's sake be very wary with his reckless

toys of Padua ; for he told me ane of the strangest tales of ane nobleman of Padua that ever I heard in my life, resembling the like purpose." This story of Padua took so strong a hold on Logan's fancy that he frequently referred to it as strangely foreshadowing their own project.

Only one thing more has to be mentioned before leaving the Gowrie Conspiracy, and it, too, is merely suggestive. We have seen that the renowned casket letters were in the possession of the earl's father, and we hear no more of them. It is likely that they were in Gowrie House at the time of the conspiracy. It is tantalising to find two such mysterious affairs coming close together, yet never meeting so as to give any assistance to each other.

A gloomy ceremony had to be performed ere the tragedy was finished. According to the old Scots fashion, the Parliamentary trial on which a forfeiture was to pass must be held with the presence of those chargeable with the guilt, whether they be alive or dead. From the hot month of August until the Estates met in November, the bodies were kept that they might be brought into the Parliament House in the Tolbooth. There the Estates decreed their name, memory, and dignity to be extinguished ; their armorial bearings cancelled ; their property to be confiscated ; and their bodies to be drawn, hanged, and quartered. Farther, their posterity and surviving brethren were declared incapable of succeeding to property or holding offices or honours in Scotland.¹ The Estates at the same time enacted that the 5th of August should ever be observed as a day of thanksgiving for the king's escape.

The period of not quite three years between the Gowrie Conspiracy and the union of the crowns was a time of unwonted peace in Scotland. It was marked, indeed, by the formal reconciliation to each other of men who had inherited family feuds. Remarkable among these were the two great houses whose disputes had shaken Scotland—Argyle and Huntly. Like two crowned heads, they negotiated and adjusted a peace.

¹ Act. Parl., iv. 199.

The chief event at Court was the birth of a third child, destined to be the most unfortunate of the unfortunate three. The Prince Charles was born at Dunfermline on the 19th of November 1600. Among such matters as slightly disturbed the serenity of the political atmosphere, the most unpleasant were a few sinister rumours that King James was secretly dealing with the Papal powers. Thus Lord Henry Howard, who told his correspondent at the Scots Court, Lord Edward Bruce, all rumours, propitious and unpropitious, says: "From Rome hath been twice advertised that strange assurances have been sent from Scotland of great mysteries and miracles to be wrought in case the prince [Henry] could once be put in the hands of a Catholic, whereof they were in hope by the favour and endeavour of a powerful instrument which would strongly labour it." And again: "Out of the archduke's camp one of her majesty's greatest commanders hath been advertised that a fire will break out in Scotland before it be long, which makes Cecil to fear, knowing in what state King James stands with England at this day, that other trains, made underground by secret pioneers within that State itself, may break out when it is least looked for."¹

The sinister rumours were strengthened by what is called in treason-law "an overt act." On the side of England, King James was charged with the writing of a letter to the Pope himself. He denied the charge; but his opponent in controversy, Cardinal Bellarmine, published the letter. It commended the Bishop of Vaison, in France—who appears to have been a Scotsman named Chisholm—to the good services of the Pope, and suggested that he should be raised to the rank of Cardinal. The letter had been written in the year 1598, but was for some time the mere source of a rumour which was denied, and it was after King James was firm on the English throne that its existence was substantiated. Balmerinoch, who was Secretary of State at the time, was put on trial

¹ Secret Correspondence of Sir Robert Cecil with James VI. of Scotland, 157, 160.

for treason, in having obtained the king's signature to the letter by fraud. He made a full confession of his guilt, stating that he had slipped it into a heap of papers which had been adjusted for the king's signature. This was possible; but it was also thought improbable if another part of the confession were true, which imported that Balmerinoch had often solicited the king to write such a letter, and that the request had ever been met by a peremptory refusal.

As Queen Elizabeth's sojourn in this world was visibly drawing to a close, there was naturally much conference and correspondence about King James's claim to the succession. As on the one hand the projects about the Infanta of Spain strengthened the claims of King James in the hearts of the English, so on the other side his chief danger lay in the projects of Essex. That he did correspond with Essex from 1596 downwards is certain, but whether he went farther than was necessary to secure the favour of a powerful man is not clear. Essex's last escapade, in fact, was a protection to the king. The whole went so far out of rational bounds, that it could not be associated with a serious policy held by sane men. When Essex was committed to the Tower, James was clamorously requested to help him. He said he "would think of it, and put himself in readiness to take any good occasion." Montjoy, who was in a condition of as rash excitement as Essex himself, sent King James a "project," on which he probably, as Orientals say, "opened the eyes of astonishment." It was, "That James should prepare an army, should march at the head of it to the Borders, should thence fulminate a demand to the English Government of an open declaration of his right to the succession, and should support the demand by sending an ambassador into England," to be, it is supposed, followed by the army if his demands were refused.¹

¹ Bruce's Correspondence. Mr Bruce says that James corresponded with Essex "for a considerable time—certainly from the year 1598." In 'Letters and State Papers during the Reign of James the Sixth,' printed for the Abbotsford Club, the correspondence goes back to 4th February 1596, p. 8.

It is a significant fact when we find the younger Cecil, who succeeded his father in power, holding confidential conferences early in the year 1601 with the two ambassadors from Scotland, the Earl of Mar and Edward Bruce. He soon afterwards began a secret correspondence with King James, conducted not in his own hand but through Lord Henry Howard. On the 4th June 1602 he gives cheerful intelligence of unanimity to Lord Mar: "It is true, as Northumberland, one of the concert, affirms, that all other colours of competition are extinct; that there is great danger of being taken sleepers at tray-trip if the king sweep suddenly; that the world doth universally bend their biasses to the Scottish side; that the glass of time being very far run, the day of the queen's death may be the day of their doom. . . . I protest unto your lordship, that at this day all men speak as freely of the next succeeding time and heir with us as if they were instantly to receive an oath in Edinburgh; and therefore no marvel though men that can draw no partners in to consent to take a true man's purse on Shooter's Hill, insert themselves into the company of honest men."¹

Perhaps if Queen Elizabeth had interpreted her faithful servants' ciphers, she might have become angry and dangerous; but the tone of the correspondence was carefully kept down. That there were many people in favour of King James's claim was scarcely a treasonable thing to say, and yet it gave him confidence and hope. What Queen Elizabeth would do was no farther indicated than by the acute statesman's assurance, from what he knew and saw, that she would not attempt to displace him by another selection. We can trace the soothing influence of this method of writing in a scene noted by George Nicolson, one of the emissaries to Scotland. In 1602, in his presence, the Laird of Kinnaird thought he should have pleased the king by "drinking to the joining of these two kingdoms in one—and that soon—and saying he had forty muskets ready for the king's service to that use; which the king said was a fault in him to wish soon or

¹ Secret Correspondence, 127.

by force, and protested he wished no haste, but God's time in it, and her majesty's days to be long and happy, without any abridgment of them, or hour of them, for any cause or kingdom to him."¹

Though, however, it involved skilful statecraft, and was extremely momentous to the little group concerned in it, this correspondence does not make lively reading for the present day. Its cautious tone and skilful modifications may be curious as a short study, but hold out little temptation to a full perusal of the whole.² Then we cannot attribute to the mere correspondence any serious influence upon the union of the crowns. It was only the indication that the event was coming about as the effect of political forces stronger than any that even Cecil could wield.

¹ Bruce, Introduction to Correspondence of King James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil, &c., 47.

² Perhaps the following specimen has as much life in it as the correspondence at large can boast of: "I beseech your majesty, give me the honour thus far to believe me, that should not be a stranger to all things of such nature which can occur in this State, that, first, the subject itself is so perilous to touch among us, as it setteth a mark on his head for ever which hatches such a bird; next, on the faith I owe to God, that there is never a prince or state in Europe with whom either mediate or immediate her majesty hath entered into speech for twelve years on that subject. No, as it is true that, such is our misfortune, as it is in her majesty's mind a capital thing to settle, so is it not in her heart so much as to bethink her how to divert it; and therefore, if you will distinguish between the pamphlets and projects of priests and fugitives, who are always labouring to set up one golden calf or other, as their fortune or fancy leadeth them, and the negotiations between princes or their ministers retaining such a belief in some well-chosen professions, as neither to be jealous of silence because you hear other idle echoes, nor mistrustful of care and industry because everything we do is not hourly made demonstrative to you, then may I, and all as I, say to themselves securely, that they have found in you a heart of adamant in a world of feathers."—Bruce, 13. A letter was written in the name of certain magnates who are represented by ciphers or signs, at an exciting moment, "the 10th of March at eleven of the clock." They say, "We do most humbly and most instantly beseech your majesty to despatch away your minister in all possible haste, for that her majesty's great danger is now so apparent and public." There is reason, they say, for activity in the intrigues of the representatives of the Papal powers with the English or their religion.—Fac-simile National MSS. of Scotland, part iii. lxxxi.

For a considerable time James Stewart's right was by no means a doctrine universally admitted. In the opinion of some it met an insurmountable obstacle—an obstacle that had already barred his succession to the English estates of his grandfather, Lennox. He was an alien. As an alien, he could not have succeeded to a rood of land in England—was he to take the whole? No doubt, as the descendant of a daughter of Henry VII. by the elder son of her daughter, he was nearest in blood. It was no longer as in the days of the wars of the Roses, when there was dubiety about the true course of the genealogical sequence. But if he were passed over as an alien, the diversion would not be great—the succession would open to Arabella Stewart, a daughter of the younger son. To meet this lawyers' pedantry, there was the mighty problem of uniting the two great divisions of the island peaceably under one head—a consummation promising salvation from endless wars, with all their countless miseries. The clearness of the genealogical claim, and the blessings to be accomplished by its realisation, together took gradual hold of the practical English mind. The doctrine of the common-lawyers was buried in the general approval of the nation. Right or wrong, according to technical logic, King James was to be the accepted King of England.

So far as the possession of an illustrious royal race was deemed a national honour, England was to become a gainer. The Tudors were lost in questionable Welsh mists. The Plantagenets themselves came of a Norman bastard; and even the Saxon royal race did not retreat into very distant ages. But, according to the established belief of the age, the King of Scots was descended of a race of monarchs who reigned hundreds of years before the dawn of Christianity. Rumour made him at that time a worthy descendant of this illustrious race. He had shown early wisdom—he was a wonder of learning; and his follies, and defects worse than follies, had yet to be learned by the people of England. His 'Basilikon Doron' completed the circle of his popularity by conveying words of comfort and hope to the Roman Catholics. Then the proud aristocracy of England would have a

family becomingly presiding over them—a royal family which was all royal. The queen had not only shown her mother's blood in raising obscurely-born men like Cecil to the highest power, but the throne was encircled by members of the Boleyn family who flaunted it over the ancient houses of the realm. All these were influences so powerful in determining the succession, as to render it a matter of no moment whether Cecil was correct or not when he said that the dying woman had made a sign of her acceptance of the King of Scots before the close.

It was one of these plebeian members of the royal family, Robert Carey, son of Lord Hunsdon, who galloped into Holyrood Court late on a Saturday night, and wakened King James to tell him that he was monarch of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland. According to the generally received account, he had made his arrangements, and was skulking about under the windows of Richmond Palace, when his sister, who was of the bedchamber, dropped out of the window, as a concerted token, a ring taken from the dead queen's finger just as the last breath had passed. The death was at three o'clock on Thursday morning, and Carey was in Edinburgh on Saturday night. It was a feat of despatch unmatched in that age. The king and his courtiers behaved with decorum. Nothing was made known beyond Holyrood House until two days later, when Sir Charles Percy and Thomas Somerset arrived with an official communication from the Privy Council of England. On the 5th of April 1603, King James, with a large train of attendants, English and Scots, left Edinburgh; and on the 6th of May he entered London.

CHAPTER LXII.

UNION OF THE CROWNS.

KING JAMES'S DEPARTURE—RECEPTION AT BERWICK—THE ROYAL PROGRESS—FEASTINGS—PAGEANTS—HUNTING—ENGLISH AND SCOTS FIELD-SPORTS—THE KING'S DELIGHT WITH HIS NEW DOMINIONS—PERSONAL SKETCHES OF THE NEW COURT—THE KING HIMSELF—HIS MOTLEY CHARACTER—CONTRAST TO HIS MOTHER—QUEEN ANNE, HER WIT, HER INFLUENCE—PRINCE HENRY—PRINCE CHARLES—GLIMPSES OF THE INTERIOR OF THE PALACE—CORRESPONDENCE OF ROYAL CHILDREN.

THE spot where the king first set his foot within his new dominions was crowded with reminiscences of that long stubborn struggle which it was his blessed fortune to close. As we have already seen, the town and liberties of Berwick-on-Tweed had been taken from Scotland at a time when all parts of England were so closely fitted together by the constitutional organisation of the country that there was no place for the new dominion; and down to a time within the memory of people not old, an Act of Parliament applicable to the United Kingdom did not include Berwick-on-Tweed unless it were brought into the Act by a special clause. England had paid her northern foes the homage of building a vast fortress there. Scotland had no modern fortress on the system of flanking embankments—only the old, lofty, stone towers, to which a temporary earthen outwork might be attached in time of need, as we have seen at the siege of Edinburgh Castle. The citadel of Berwick might have ranked among the greatest and strongest in the world of the fortresses raised under the new system. Even to this day its banks and ditches have

more likeness to the remains of some Continental fortress of the end of last century, than to anything belonging to the age of the Tudors. With Carlisle Castle at the other side of the island, and Norham, Werk, and other Border strengths of the older kind uniting them in a string, England had placed a barrier along her border well fitted—the difference of period and circumstances considered—to rival the great line of fortified wall which protected the boundary of the old Roman empire in Britain.

There was preparation in Berwick to announce to King James in emphatic shape the powerful character of the fortress now his own. An enthusiastic recorder of his progress southwards says:—

“When his highness came within some half-mile of the town, and began to take view thereof, it suddenly seemed like an enchanted castle; for from the mouth of dreadful engines—not long before full-fed by moderate artsmen that knew how to stop and empty the brass and iron paunches of those roaring noises—came such a tempest, as deathful and sometimes more dreadful than thunder, that all the ground thereabout trembled as in an earthquake, the houses and towers staggering, wrapping the whole town in a mantle of smoke, wherein the same was for a while hid from the sight of its royal owner. But nothing violent can be permanent. It was too hot to last; and yet I have heard it credibly reported that a better peal of ordnance was never in any soldier’s memory (and there are some old King Harry’s lads in Berwick, I can tell you) discharged in that place. Neither was it very strange, for no man can remember Berwick honoured with the approach of so powerful a master.”¹

After this salutation, he was handed over to the sumptuous hospitalities of the great landed potentates whose estates lay conveniently at hand on his journey to London. In Scotland, the grim, tall, stone buildings which were the fortresses of the country were also the dwellings of the country gentlemen. Their walls were thick, their windows small and parsimonious of light. Everything about

¹ Nichols’s Progresses, i. 63.

them betokened danger and defence, leaving little room or thought for the ornamental and the enjoyable. Even the Scots mansions that aimed at the French luxuriance of decorations, had their ornaments high up in the air, with narrow thick stonework below, very defensible against anything but artillery. In England all was in contrast to this. The wide, hospitable, Tudor architecture, with its oriels throwing a flood of light into comfortable apartments, prevailed, testifying to a country where the law had put down private warfare, and rendered each man safe in his own house. The incomes of the owners of these fine mansions were almost a greater contrast still, when compared with the means of the gentry of Scotland. Their hearts were opened widely to their new monarch; and they excelled all hospitalities, known even in England, to honour his passage. It gladdened the monarch's heart into great enjoyment; and we need not wonder at this when he remembered that among the latest hospitalities he had received in a Scots mansion were those bestowed on him in Gowrie House.

The hospitalities of a royal progress had become a national institution in England. It was much encouraged and developed by Queen Elizabeth. Perhaps her loneliness of heart sent her to find relief in the excitement of such scenes. Perhaps here, too, as in the discipline of her Court, a spirit of chivalry or gallantry procured for her more willing hospitality than a male monarch would have been welcomed with. The feudal prerogative of purveyance and pre-emption for the monarch's service had, like other prerogatives, been widened. It arose in days of warfare for the service of the monarch's armed force, and thus, in theory at least, for the defence of the realm; and it was continued for the court of personal attendants and guests which followed the monarch in more peaceful days. The sentiment seems to have spread among the richer landowners, that it was pleasanter to come forward and give than to wait for the coming exaction. If the hand had to be more liberal, it was the hand of the great man who was able to offer hospitality to his sovereign, not of the serf who gave grudgingly what feudal power demanded.

When a country gentleman had been so fortunate as to accumulate convertible wealth in addition to his estate, to spend it in a notable royal reception was one of the accepted and natural uses to which it might be put. As in all other arenas for the display of wealth, one entertainer vied with another in the splendours of his entertainment; and it was afterwards noticed as a curious incident, that in James's progress towards London the lead in this sort of competition was taken by Sir Oliver Cromwell, the uncle of the great Protector.

The outlay on such occasions was in a manner an investment. The house where a great reception had been given on a royal progress became famous, and the feasting and pageantry of the occasion were discussed by generation after generation as a purchase of fame or notoriety. Many of these investments may be said to have been sound, since their history has passed from tradition into a somewhat expansive literature. The collector of the progresses of Queen Elizabeth, having filled with them three stout quarto volumes, bestowed other four on [the progresses of King James. Of these, the first is almost entirely devoted to the journey from Edinburgh to London. These volumes, in their size, their monotony, and their costly illustrations, seem somewhat akin to the receptions themselves, with their enormous gormandising and their heavy wearisome pageantry. There is a limit to all appetites; and one can suppose that when satiety was reached, there must have been a feeling of discomfort in the presence of the accumulated masses of multifarious cookery, as there is a tiresomeness in reading the history of the successive culinary efforts and triumphs. It is easy to be seen from such descriptions, as well as from old cookery-books, that the preparation of the food of the rich on State occasions was then of a much more complicated character than any preparations of viands at the present day. Besides a great variety of materials used in meats, there were efforts to make them act a picturesque part in the pageants. In this sort of art the highest triumph in the union of the real and the ideal was achieved by an entertainer who was enabled to place on his table two complete boars, cooked and

piping hot, whose attitude was that of draught animals drawing a gigantic pudding constructed in the shape of a waggon. It is even some relief to the tedious narratives of heavy feeding and pedantic pageantry, when the king's Danish friends, with whom he had been "drinking and driving our," came to him to resume the same pursuit, and so vary the routine by a touch of fierce wassail.

The accounts of the pageantry and mimicry at these receptions make dreary reading; and any of them would, to a theatrical audience of the present day, make doubtless as dreary an exhibition. The modern pantomime—the legitimate descendant of the pageants—is a result of machinery. Its progress has followed that of the mechanical arts; and as the British are the best mechanists in the world, so they can produce the finest specimens of this kind of work. When the organisation is complete, all in front is bright fairy-land. The laws of gravitation, and all the impediments that make the human creature of the earth earthy, are suspended, and he is for a time easy master of all the elements. His choice may be a revel of mermaids and tritons in the caverns of the deep, or a flight of aerial beings skimming the waters or ascending into the skies. But the adult spectator knows that in the dingy and dirty recesses behind there is an organisation of ugly machinery—windlasses, ropes, pulleys, and levers—with which mechanics of the most unideal kind are hard at work, raising or sinking heavy weights of flooring and scenery; while complicated arrangements are worked by anxious attendants, to prevent the fairy beings who have disappeared into thin air on the bright side, from being dashed to pieces on the dark. In the country-houses of the period of Elizabeth and James, such severance between the spectacle and the mechanism was impossible—the ropes, the pulleys, the preparation of the actors, and many other things fitted to dispel the illusion, were all too manifest to the audience. Perhaps a greater amount of real pageantry is crowded into a pantomime evening at Drury Lane, than a whole reign could produce in the age of private pageants; yet we consign our perfected system to the denizens of the nursery.

Scott's account of the revelries at Kenilworth may be taken by the general reader as a good type of that kind of entertainment. Though it is as precise as the dull memorials of the Court chroniclers, it is read with interest, because all its elaborate escapades are worked into a story of deeply pathetic and tragic incidents. We can see that what decorum these things had in the reign of Elizabeth deserted them in her successor's. The caustic Harrington says: "I have much marvelled at these strange pageantries, and they do bring to my remembrance what passed of this sort in our queen's days, of which I was some time an humble presenter and assistant; but I did never see such lack of good order, discretion, and sobriety as I have now done." This is said in commenting on the pageants and feasts at the reception of the royal Danes; and although Sir John is avowedly sarcastic and epigrammatic in his way of describing them, the doings must have been sufficiently scandalous that afforded fair game for his wit: "One day a great feast was held, and, after dinner, the representation of Solomon his temple and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made."

"The lady who did play the queen's part did carry most precious gifts to both their majesties; but forgetting the steps arising to the canopy, overset her caskets into his Danish majesty's lap, and fell at his feet, though I rather think it was in his face. Much was the hurry and confusion; cloths and napkins were at hand to make all clean. His majesty then got up and would dance with the Queen of Sheba; but he fell down and humbled himself before her, and was carried to an inner chamber and laid on a bed of state."

The pageant shifts, and "now did appear, in rich dress, Hope, Faith, and Charity. Hope did essay to speak, but wine rendered her endeavours so feeble that she withdrew, and hoped the king would excuse her brevity. Faith was then alone, for I am certain she was not joined with good works, and left the Court in a staggering condition. Charity came to the king's feet, and seemed to cover the multitude of sins her sisters had committed: in some sort she made obeisance and brought gifts, but said she would

return home again, as there was no gift which heaven had not already given to his majesty. She then returned to Hope and Faith, who were both sick." After much that is less picturesque and more offensive, the conclusion comes in antithesis like the rest: "Now did Peace make entry, and strive to get foremost to the king; but I grieve to tell how great wrath she did discover unto those of her attendants; and, much contrary to her semblance, most rudely made war with her olive-branch, and laid on the pates of those who did oppose her coming."¹

It is true that mummery, pageantry, and excess were features of the Court-life of the age; but the share contributed to these peculiarities by the Court of James must have been excessive, to be singled out, as it was, for notice. Even when profligate excess is absent from these royal frolics, we find not decorum in its place. For instance, Weldon tells how, "after the king supped, he would come forth to see pastimes and fooleries in which Sir Edward Zouch, Sir George Goring, and Sir John Flint were the chief and master fools—and surely the fooling got them more than any other's wisdom,—sometimes presenting David Droman, and Archie Armstrong, the king's fool, on the back of other fools, to tilt one another till they fell together by the ears. Sometimes they performed antick dances. But Sir John Millicent, who was never known before, was commended for notable fooling, and was indeed the best extempore fool of them all."²

The following short account, written by poor Arabella Stewart before her evil days came upon her, contains the names of some devices which may be familiar to the learned in sports and pastimes. It is dated from the Court at Fulston, 8th December 1603: "Whilst I was at Winchester, there were certain child's plays remembered by the fair ladies—viz., 'I pray, my lord, give me a course in your park;' 'Rise, pig, and go;' 'One penny follow me,' &c. When I came to Court, they were as highly in request as ever cracking of nuts was. So I was by the

¹ *Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 349-351.

² *Secret History*; *Letters (Maitland Club)*, 23.

mistress of the revels not only compelled to play at I know not what—for till that day I never heard of a play called 'Fier'—but even persuaded by the princely example to play the child again." We generally give our ancestors credit for early hours—the earlier the farther back we look ; yet "this exercise is mostly used from ten of the clock at night to two or three in the morning."¹

As we are at present only following King James to his new home, the only excuse for bringing in scenes which occurred a year or two after his accession is, that they in some measure interpret his character in the shape to which he speedily brought the more decorous pageants of Queen Elizabeth's time, as they were presented for his entertainment by his exulting subjects on his progress southwards.

He received many precious gifts from wealthy corporations and local magnates. Among these were horses of rare and high breeding, richly appavelled. The givers of these paid their homage to the king's passion for hunting. Though he came from a country where wild animals were more abundant, the native field-sports were not so much to his taste as those which he found in England. The nomenclature of England about forests and parks, or preserves, had found its way into Scotland ; but the things themselves as they were in England—tracts watched with much care and cost, and artificially supplied with game—were hardly to be found there. The hunting-fields were as nature made them, and the use of them was restricted rather by natural than artificial difficulties. There was excitement and enjoyment in the pursuit, no doubt ; but the avowed end of all field-sport was that of the primitive hunter—to slay and eat. Thus the deer and the wild boar were hunted or stalked. The wolf and the fox, being not only competitors with man for the edible game, but destructive to farm animals, were to be extirpated by all easiest and shortest methods. It was no matter that their carcasses lay rotting, and so they were often caught and left in snares. They were not generally hunted for sport ; and it is a novelty to find, in a letter of the year 1631, the Earl of Mar writing from Stirling : "Being come

¹ Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 24.

to stay in this town a good part of the winter, I think my greatest sport shall be the hunting of the fox; therefore I will earnestly entreat you to send me with this bearer a couple of good earth dogs." But had an inhabitant of Scotland in the seventeenth century been told of a possible community in which the fox was carefully cultivated for their enjoyment, it would have held the same position in his mind as the anthropology of 'Gulliver's Travels.' To this day, in remote parts of Scotland, the English stranger is puzzled by a rough peasant calling himself "a fox-hunter," and not less when he gives the further explanation that it his duty to "destroy vermin."

The highest grade of hunting sport in Scotland was, indeed, rather too high for King James, and it is perhaps significant of character that it is more associated with his mother than himself. This was the great Tinchel, which cast its action and excitement over whole provinces and multitudes of people of all grades. The notables would assemble under the auspices of the local chief in Athol, Braemar, or Badenoch. Before their arrival gillies or tinchel men had been scouring the hills within a radius of fifty or sixty miles, driving before them all the wild beasts, until at last there came pouring into the selected glen the red deer in hundreds or in thousands, accompanied by a rabble of wolves, foxes, and the other baser animals. The hunters hutted themselves and lived for some days on the spot. If there were gentle ladies or illustrious visitors among them, the huts would be turned into palaces—as on one occasion when there was a mimic castle with towers and bastions built of green wood, with a moat peopled by delicate fish. It was an opportunity for showing hospitalities that had the abundance, and in a manner the splendours, at the command of chiefs who had much wealth in devoted followers, but little in ordinary exchangeable value.¹

¹ We have two well-known accounts of the Tinchel—one in the Pitscottie Chronicle (345), the other, in the Penyless Pilgrimage of John Taylor, the Water Poet. The bill of fare in each might have had attractions for King James. "All kinds of drink, as ale, beer, wine, both white and claret, malvasie, muscatel, elegant hippocrass, and aqua vitæ; further, there was of meats—wheat-bread, maize-

It is under King James that we find the dawn of artificial hunting-grounds, or spaces laid out for parks or preserves in the peopled part of Scotland. What there was of that kind was a poor imitation of the English model. When King James afterwards paid a visit to Scotland, he found at his hunting-park at Falkland but sorry sport, although great efforts were made to have it in hunting order for his exclusive use. Meanwhile he found, on his way to London, such opportunities of

bread and gingebread, with fleshe — beef and mutton, lamb, veal, and venison, goose, gryse [pork], capon, cunning, cran, swan, pairtrick, plover, duck, drake, brissel, cock and paunies, black kock and muir-fowl, capercaillies. And also the stanks that were round about the palace were full of all delicate fishes, as salmond, trouts, pearches, pikes, eels.” Nearly a century had elapsed between this and the scene witnessed by Taylor, in whose time Pitscottie’s account was not known. Yet there is a community between them in the estimate of the abundant provender “on the side of a bank, many kettles and pots boiling, and many spits turning and winding, with great variety of cheer, as venison, baked sodden roast and stewed beef, mutton, goats, kid, hares, fresh salmon, pigeons, hens, capons, chickens, partridges, moor-coots, heath-cocks, cappercellies and termagants; good ale, sack, white and claret, tent, with most potent aqua vitæ.”—Works, 135. There is a third account of a great Scots tinchel, but though Queen Mary was present, it is hidden where such a story is not likely to be looked for. It is in a controversial work by William Barclay of the Aberdeenshire Barclays, the father of the author of *Argenis*. See “*Gulielmi Barclaii de regno et regali potestate, adversus Buchananum, Brutum Boucherium et reliquos monarchomachos*” (edit. 1612), p. 278. He was a child when in the year 1563 it was his privilege to see a tinchel, which drove two thousand deer before Queen Mary. The entertainer, the Lord Atholl, drew the queen’s attention to one grand animal whose movements controlled those of the whole herd—a sight he would never forget. “*Sed ita mihi crede, omnes illi cervi, velut agmine composito incedebant—hærebit enim, heræbitque semper id animo spectaculum meo—ut ducem unum et rectorem cerneret præeuntem, quem alii quoquo iret subsequebantur; is autem*

“*Cervus erat forma præstanti et cornibus ingens.*”

This scene is worked into an argument for the divine right of kings; and in its whole tenor, with the line from the *Æneid* so aptly brought in, it would suit the taste of King James, for whose eye it was no doubt printed. But it comes signally under the well-known sarcasm of Algernon Sidney, that the advocates of divine right are more apt to take their examples from the instincts of the brutes than from the reason of men.

enjoying his favourite sport, that he pursued it with a childish delight. Even the English, a hunting people, were astonished at his zeal, and complained that they could get no attention to business while the king had easy access to a hunting-field. Of course, during his progress, those who had the felicity to possess the means were passing glad to put them at the disposal of the new monarch. The spirit of laborious trifling which animated the pageants seems to have been at work here also. Only an adept in field-science can understand the precise nature of the arrangement told in the following words, but any one can see that it was complicated and ingenious:—

“From Stamford Hill to London was made a train with a tame deer, with such twinings and doubles that the hounds could not take it faster than his majesty proceeded; yet still, by the industry of the huntsman, and the subtlety of him that made the train, in a full-mouthed cry all the way, never farther distant than one close from the highway whereby his highness rid, and for the most part directly against his majesty, whom, together with the whole company, had the lee-wind from the hounds, to the end that they might the better perceive and judge of the uniformity in the cries.”¹

Ever as he went, the enthusiasm and excitement that had attended him from Berwick gathered strength and breadth. They came to their climax as he neared Theobalds, the domain of Cecil, whom he knew to be his faithful and assured servant. It is often said that no one

¹ Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 23. The violent affection of the king for this sport, and also perhaps his knowledge of the perfections of it, might possibly commend his manner to a master of hounds of the present day as one before his age. For instance, in a rambling letter to Buckingham he offers his ardent gratitude “for breeding me so fine a kennel of young hounds, some of them so fair and well shaped, and some of them so fine pretty little ones, as they are worthy to lie in Steeny and Kate’s bed. And all of them run together in a lump, both at scent and view. And God thank the master of the horse for providing me such a number of fair useful horses fit for my hand. In a word, I protest I was never master of such horses and hounds: the bearer will tell you what fine running we had yesterday.”—Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 394.

knows what will stir the enthusiasm of the English nature, but once roused it is a vast and uncontrollable moral phenomenon. Some half a century earlier the question would have been, whether a king coming from the hated Scots could pass in safety to the seat of government. And he who now came was not of an aspect to fascinate the world by his presence. As it fell out, not only did he receive the natural homage of the courtiers and the liberal hospitality of the country squires, but the people flocked round him in wild and joyous excitement. One who stood waiting at the gate of Theobalds, after telling that the greatness of the concourse of people "was incredible to tell of," goes on:—

"Then, for his majesty going up the walk, there came before his majesty some of the nobility, some barons, knights, esquires, gentlemen, and others, among whom were the Sheriffs of Essex and the most of his men, the trumpets sounding next before his highness, sometimes one, sometimes another; his majesty not riding continually between the same two, but sometimes one, sometimes another, as seemed best to his highness, the whole nobility of our land and Scotland round about him observing no place of superiority—all bareheaded. All whom alighting from their horses at the entrance into the first court, save only his majesty alone, who rid along still, four noblemen laying their hands upon his steed—two before, and two behind. In this manner he came till he was come to the court door where myself stood, where he alighted from his horse, from which he had not gone ten princely paces but there was delivered him a petition by a young gentleman, his majesty returning him this gracious answer, that he should be heard and have justice. At the entrance into that court stood many noblemen, among whom was Sir Robert Cecil, who there meeting his majesty, conducted him into his house; all which was practised with as great applause of people as could be, hearty prayer, and throwing up of hats. His majesty had not stayed above an hour in his chamber, but hearing the multitude throng so fast into the uppermost court, to see his highness, as his grace was informed, he

showed himself openly out of his chamber window by the space of half an hour together, after which time he went into the labyrinth-like garden to walk, where he recreated himself in the Meander's compact of bays, rosemary, and the like overshadowing his walk, to defend himself from the heat of the sun, till supper-time, at which was such plenty of provision for all sorts of men in their due place as struck me with admiration."¹

It is not wonderful that King James associated pleasant memories with the scene of such an ovation. He set his heart on Theobalds, and it afterwards became his own and his favourite rural palace.

This may afford a good opportunity for attempting a sketch of that royal family which the great realm of England received from her poor neighbour. Of the head of the house, the king himself, the features, both moral and physical, were so large and grotesque that the poorest artist could scarcely fail to render them, although not in a harmonious whole, for in some instances there are inconsistencies which it is scarce possible to reconcile. He was a very timid and irresolute man, and yet on more than one occasion he behaved with an amount of nerve and courage which the greatest of heroes could not have excelled. People from the other side of the North Sea speak of his journey to bring home his wife as a thing which he surely would not have attempted had he known the perils of the coast of Norway in winter. Whether he knew what he incurred or not on that occasion, we have seen his conduct on another when the peril was not of his own seeking. He held his own in the hand-to-hand struggle with young Ruthven. He reminded the young man of the presence he was in, and the propriety of removing his hat. He corrected the mysterious man in armour when he was opening the wrong window. When Ramsay drew the dagger and let go the king's hawk to free his hand, James put his foot on the leash to prevent his favourite from escaping by the window. Finally, the struggle had taught him that his assailant wore secret

¹ Saville in Nichols, i. 137.

armour, so he told Ramsay to strike below it. It is known that men of a nervous temperament, when at bay and desperate, become unconscious of their position, and act from a sort of mechanical influence, as if there were no danger near them. Are we so to account for these wonderful instances of presence of mind?

The nature of the man is one that can best be described after the Plutarchian method, by contrast, and the contrast shall be, in this case, with his mother. She has been renowned over the world for her wondrous beauty; and if it were not that the world, in the things it dwells on and celebrates, prefers grace to deformity, the son's ugliness might have been as widely renowned. It was a common tradition that Rizzio was uncomely and misshapen; and the recollection of this gave emphasis to the taunt that he was "the son of Senior Davie,"—a taunt so much on the lips of that numerous body in Scotland who disliked their king, that it cannot but sometimes have come to his ear. His mother's beauty was adorned by natural dignity; she was fully endowed with the repose and self-assurance which are in becoming harmony with rank and power. The son, on the other hand, seemed ever to find it necessary to remind the world by word or deed that he was every inch a king; he was as fussy and pompous in expanding his rank and power before the eyes of the vulgar as the *bourgeois gentilhomme* of Molière. Queen Mary had learning and accomplishments, but they lay stored aside for important use. As she drew on them for help when she was throwing the bondage of her fascinations over any victim, pedantic display was not the shape in which they would serve her; and for the more serious business of a sovereign it was her policy not to seem learned above the usage of her sex, but yet to have the knowledge by which she could defend herself at hand in case of need. All the world knows what a bragging pedant the son was, and how he held his learning ever on his tongue, as one whose mind had been fed with meats too strong for its digestion.

So it was in the use of duplicity. Perhaps no one in that age could handle it with such easy subtlety as Queen Mary, and that because she kept it for important occa-

sions, and even then concealed it under that genial frankness which seemed to be not a mask but the natural face of her life. The son, on the other hand, was ever playing tricks, by way of exercising himself in that chronic system of mendacity and deception which he chose to nourish as kingcraft.

Even in the evil repute that haunted both, there was the antithesis of the sublime and the ridiculous. The charges against the mother were of those great appalling crimes which frighten mankind ; yet they had to be sought out under a covering of calm decorum and gentle elegance, such as might become unsullied virtue. Her son, on the other hand, wallowed in filth, moral and physical. His Court was the crew of Momus, without the seductive cup of Circe that was employed to seduce better natures to the level of its degradation. To whoever approached it, the eye and nostrils told of the abomination before he entered, and he made his election in full consciousness of what it was. The meanness of those about him, his loathsome familiarities with them, his diseased curiosity about the things that rightly-tempered minds only approach at the bidding of necessity and duty, his propensity to touch and stir whatever was rank and offensive, afforded to his malignant enemies the range over the whole scale of sensual vices as their armoury. And yet there is reason to believe that he was not an unfaithful husband, and that his only personal vice was in the bottle. Yet although his indulgence in drinking was, like the other offences of his habits, not only undraped by any outward cover of decorum, but in a manner profusely thrust on the gaze of all men, it appears to have been superficial rather than deep ; he seems to have indulged in continuous soaking, after the German fashion, rather than, after the manner of his own countrymen, to have reserved his powers for deep drinking-bouts.

Scotland, as a poorer and ruder country than England, was naturally more tolerant of so grotesque a figure. His oddities, too, had grown up among the Scots ; and as they were to some extent moulded on national characteristics, they were naturally not so obvious and offensive to his

own countrymen as to the people of his new dominion. Thus, although he had many enemies among his Scots subjects, it is not until his oddities passed under the eye of the English wits of the day that we find them described with sarcastic picturesqueness. Among the many sketches of these, perhaps the most powerful is the following from the stinging pen of Sir Anthony Weldon. It may be doubted if there is in the English language a more thoroughly finished picture of a shambling lout:—

“He was of a middle stature, more corpulent through his clothes than in his body, yet fat enough; his clothes ever being made large and easy, the doublets quilted for stiletto-proof; his breeches in great plaits, and full stuffed. He was naturally of a timid disposition, which was the greatest reason of his quilted doublets. His eyes large, ever rolling after any stranger came in his presence, inasmuch as many for shame have left the room, being out of countenance. His beard was very thin; his tongue too large for his mouth, which ever made him speak full in the mouth, and made him drink very uncomely, as if eating his drink, which came out into the cup on each side of his mouth. His skin was as soft as taffeta sarcenet, which felt so because he never washed his hands—only rubbed his finger-ends slightly with the wet end of a napkin. His legs were very weak, having had, as was thought, some foul play in his youth, or rather before he was born, that he was not able to stand at seven years of age—that weakness made him ever leaning on other men’s shoulders. His walk was ever circular, his fingers ever in that walk fiddling about his codpiece. He was very temperate in his exercises and in his diet, and not intemperate in his drinking; however, in his old age, and Buckingham’s jovial suppers, when he had any turn to do with him, made him sometimes overtaken, which he would the very next day remember and repent with tears. It is true he drank very often, which was rather out of a custom than any delight; and his drinks were of that kind for strength, as frontenac, canary, high-country wine, tent, and strong ale, that had he not had a very strong brain might have daily been overtaken, although he seldom drank at any

time above four spoonfuls, many times not above one or two. . . .

"In his diet, apparel, and journeys he was very constant. In his apparel so constant, as by his goodwill he would never change his clothes till almost worn out to rags—his fashion never ; insomuch as one bringing to him a hat of a Spanish block, he cast it from him, swearing he neither loved them nor their fashions. Another time, bringing him roses on his shoes, he asked if they would make him a ruff-footed dove—one yard of sixpenny ribbon served that turn. His diet and journeys was so constant, that the best-observing courtier of our time was wont to say, were he asleep seven years he would tell where the king every day had been, and every dish he had had on his table."

The author of these characteristics of the outward man says little about his intellectual and moral nature, but that little has its point : "He was very witty, and had as many ready witty jests as any man living, at which he would not smile himself, but deliver them in a grave and serious manner. He was very liberal of what he had not in his own grip, and would rather part with a hundred pounds he never had in his keeping, than one twenty-shilling-piece within his own custody." "By his frequent sermons he appeared religious ; yet his Tuesday sermons (if ye will believe his own countrymen that lived in these times when they were erected, and well understood the cause of erecting them) were dedicated for a strange piece of devotion.

"He would make a great deal too bold with God in his passion, both in cursing and swearing, and one strain higher verging on blasphemy ; but he would in his better temper say he 'hoped God would not impute them as sins and lay them to his charge, seeing they proceeded from passion.' He had need of great assurance rather than hopes that could make daily so bold with God.

"He was very crafty and cunning in petty things, as the circumventing any great man, the change of a favourite, or insomuch as a very wise man was wont to say, he 'believed him the wisest fool in Christendom,

meaning him wise in small things, but a fool in weighty affairs."¹

Another writer, in a mere description of an interview with King James, affords an exquisite sketch of his motley character. Sir John Harington writes to Sir Amyas Paulet in January 1607. He had an audience of King James, who began in complimentary fashion on the Harington family: "Then he inquired much of learning, and showed me his own in such sort as made me remember my examiner at Cambridge aforetime. He sought much to know my advances in philosophy, and uttered profound sentences of Aristotle, and suchlike writers, which I had never read, and which some are bold enough to say others do not understand; but this I must pass by. The prince did now press my reading to him part of a canto in Ariosto; praised my utterance, and said he had been informed of many, as to my learning, in the time of the queen. He asked me 'what I thought pure wit was made

¹ Weldon's Character of King James, vol. ii. of Scott's collection on the 'Secret History of the Court of James I.' The "Tuesday's sermons" were a weekly commemoration of his deliverance from Gowrie by a household service. Weldon's "Character" was not printed until the year 1650, some time after his death. It is to be found, under the year 1625, in the Annals of Sir James Balfour, who says, a friend, "at the close of the annual of this king's life, sent me the following character under his hand, and desired me, if I so pleased, to insert the same at the end of King James the Sixth, his Life and Reign, in my Annals." Scott gives the following account of Weldon: "His native county was Kent, and his father was clerk of the kitchen, or held some such office in the household of Queen Elizabeth. Sir Anthony Weldon himself was preferred to be one of the clerks of the Board of Green Cloth. In this capacity he attended James I. upon his visit to his ancient and original kingdom. But the fare of Scotland, even when amended for the presence of her native monarch, was but indifferently suited to the hereditary taste of Sir Anthony Weldon, educated, as it were, among the flesh-pots of the English Court: and he gave vent to his contempt in a libel, in which the pride, poverty, and Puritanism, but especially the bad cheer, of Scotland, were ridiculed without mercy. This piece he inadvertently wrapped up in a record of the Board of Green Cloth, which circumstance, together with the handwriting, having ascertained the author, he was dismissed from his office—a severe punishment for writing a *jeu d'esprit* which it does not appear he had any intention to make public."—Secret History, i. 302.

of, and whom it did best become ; whether a king should not be the best clerk in his own country ; and if this land did not entertain good opinion of his learning and good wisdom.' His majesty did much press for my opinion touching the power of Satan in matter of witchcraft ; and asked me, with much gravity, 'if I did truly understand why the devil did work more with ancient women than others.'" " More serious discourse did next ensue, wherein I wanted room to continue and sometime room to escape ; for the queen his mother was not forgotten, nor Davison neither. His highness told me her death was visible in Scotland before it did really happen, being, as he said, 'spoken of in secret by those whose power of sight presented to them a bloody head dancing in the air.' He then did remark much on this gift, and said he had sought out of certain books a sure way to attain knowledge of future chances. Hereat he named many books, which I did not know, nor by whom written ; but advised me not to consult some authors which would lead me to evil consultations. I told his majesty 'the power of Satan had, I much feared, damaged my bodily frame ; but I had not farther will to court his friendship, for my soul's hurt.' We next discoursed somewhat on religion, when at length he said : 'Now, sir, you have seen my wisdom in some sort, and I have pried into yours. I pray you, do me justice in your report, and in good season I will not fail to add to your understanding in such points as I may find you lack amendment.' I made courtesy hereat, and withdrew down the passage and out at the gate, amidst the many varlets and lordly servants who stood around."¹

He had one virtue as a ruler which would go far in good repute at the present day—he was a pacific sovereign. His selected maxim was, "Blessed are the peacemakers ;" and practically he followed it in the neutral sense of avoiding the responsibility of war. How his mother's disposition and career were the reverse of this—how prone she was to strife and blood, and how it had been permitted

¹ Harington's *Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 367-370.

to her to curse the world by the exercise of her propensities, we have fully seen. And yet, in comparison with her strange eventful history, the peaceful tenor of her son's reign loses the dignity that an eminent regal virtue should have bestowed on it. In truth his pacific tendencies came forth in a form uncongenial to the period, and perhaps to all periods. It expressed itself in personal timidity, and that was a defect so odious that no one could tolerate it, so as patiently to examine what good influence there might be lurking behind it. Personally he earned the reward of his pacific nature. He was the first monarch of his race since the Jameses began who was permitted to reach the natural duration of his days ; for though his grandfather was not slain, his end was hastened by violence. When we trace the genealogic line of his house, we find it inaugurated by the murder of his father and the ruin of his mother, ending in the scaffold ; and we find him followed by a son beheaded and a grandson dethroned.

Such was the king who passed to his new throne in triumph, the desired of all English hearts. It seemed as if there were in his motley character some spots and colours on which every party, both in Church and State, could found some morsel of hope for the future. Having been king in a Presbyterian community, he would surely not press harshly on the Separatists and Puritans. Yet the High Churchmen found him uttering sound opinions ; and to the Romanists, besides certain glimpses of intelligence in his writings and his conduct, giving foundation for hope, he had a substantial hereditary claim, and as the son of a martyr of the Church they received instructions from Rome to accept him as their king. All this stands forth as one of the most conspicuous practical lessons on the incompleteness of human wisdom and the uncertainty of human designs. It is perhaps hardly possible, in the lives of great kings and statesmen, to find any one who, by the mere aid of his own deep sagacity, planned and carried into effect so completely fortunate a destiny as that which fell to King James. And yet if we look for the personal causes of all this prosperity, we

shall find them rather in defects or weaknesses than in great endowments.

The new King of England was followed by a cheerful household, to enliven the dreary abode of the companionless old queen. There was his wife, Anne of Denmark ; Prince Henry, nine years old ; Elizabeth, eight ; and Charles, three. A third son, Duke Robert, had died in his cradle about a year before the migration. Queen Anne crosses the history of the period privately and silently ; yet one can see enough of her to find that she had a character of her own, which exercised an unseen influence on the Court and her family. We have a casual glimpse of the early married life of Queen Anne in the complacent Memoirs of Sir James Melville. He was, as we have seen, deep in the diplomacies about the marriage, and he was appointed leader or administrator of the queen's little Court, in the capacity of "her hynes's counsellor, and gentleman of her chamber." The choice was probably a good one. Melville was a highly-cultivated man, who had haunted Courts and seen much of the world. While doing dutifully the services committed to him he looked to his own interests ; and perhaps his character seems the more that of a selfish man, that he did not pursue those interests with the hard brazen rapacity of many others. He was a kindly man, and his kindness naturally gravitated towards princes and queens. Taking his own account of his entrance on his counsellorship, it would seem that the commendations of his capacities were so high as to alarm the queen at the idea of being the object on which he was to exercise them. He tells how the king "showed unto the queen how that she and all her nation were addebted unto me for the continual goodwill and report that I made of that nation ; and also how that I had seen many countries, and was a man of so great experience that both he and she might learn of me sundry things profitable for their well and standing of their estate ; and that the queen his mother found herself mikle relieved by my conversation and service of importance, as well here at hame as when I was employed by her in other countries. Thus far his majesty said about my deserv-

ings, to set me out, and to cause her majesty take the better liking to me." But the king had said too much, as often was his fate. Melville saw the pouting indications of feminine dislike, and when he pressed the duties of his office, she turned and briefly demanded if he was "ordained to be her keeper." Here was occasion for the soothing influence of the courtier. Suggested by the reverse of so invidious a supposition, his functions were those of the reverential servant, because "her dignity required to be honourably served with men and women, both young and old, in sundry occupations." He succeeded in extracting from her an admission that the idea had been nourished in her by the tattle of some about her, and this gave Melville the opportunity to show how he "was put in his service to instruct such indiscreet persons, and also to give them good example how to behave themselves dutifully and reverently unto her majesty, and to hold them a'back, and that was to keep her from their rashness and importunity."¹

Queen Anne was afterwards sorely assailed by imputations which seem to have been causeless, and to have sprung out of that propensity to court gossip and suspicion, whence no virtue or prudence could at that time protect a princess who was both handsome and lively. It gave force and motive to the efforts of her assailants that she was suspected of a leaning to Popery. For this charge there was sufficient ground in the logic of that day, though it will not stand the test of less partial comment. She was no supporter of the zealous party in the Church of Scotland. They found it hard to bend her to conformity with their discipline, and therefore they readily believed that her heart belonged to the enemy. But the same eyes that looked in sour suspicion on her conduct and deportment serve unconsciously to guard her memory from the rumours collected in distant Courts. We have seen how the correspondence of the residents with their own Courts have been rife with announcements of events that have left no

¹ Memoirs, 394, 395.

trace at home. When such things touch a life that to all appearance was serene and uneventful, they are less to be trusted than when, as we have seen, they lend additions and aggravations to the known events of a turbulent life. When those who closely watched at home could reveal nothing, we are not to expect light from the archives of distant Courts, and we have here one of the instances where it happens that increased activity in research is apt to lead one further from the simple truth. Even to one who had the opportunities of the ambassador from France—Christophe de Harlay, Seigneur de Beaumont—we may decline to listen when he reports, in utter contradiction to the other estimates of her character, that she was ambitious and sanguinary.¹

But whatever she may have done in early life to justify the rumours that she was intriguing for the Church of Rome, she died in 1619 ostensibly a sound Protestant of the Church of England. Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, and King, Bishop of London, attended at her deathbed. When they prayed, it is set down that "word by word she followed them." "Then the Bishop of Canterbury said, 'Madam, we hope your majesty doth not trust in your own merits nor to the mediation of saints, but only by the blood and merits of our Saviour Christ Jesus you shall be saved.' 'I do,' she answers; 'and withal,' she says, 'I renounce the mediation of all saints and my own merits, and does only rely upon my Saviour Christ, who has redeemed my soul with His blood.' " ²

¹ "Son humeur, que l'on dict être fort cruelle, brouillonne et sanguinaire." He believes that she was capable of plots for getting rid of her husband, that she might reign as guardian of her son. Teulet (4to), iii. 670-673. De Beaumont's suspicions were sharpened by the duty laid on him to secure the new sovereign as the ally of France, and defeat the machinations of Spain.

² "Madam the Queen's Death and Maner theiroy," among Sir James Balfour's MSS. ; Abbotsford Miscellany, 81. This must be held an effectual contradiction of a statement very confidently made in a review on Ranke's 'History of the Popes,' where he is charged with omitting the fact that "Anne of Denmark, James's queen, was a *secret Roman Catholic*, in regular correspondence, receiving letters and indulgences from Rome" (Quarterly Review, April 1837). This is said

Anne of Denmark on one or two occasions had such explosions of temper as good women, conscious of rectitude, are subject to ; and we can easily believe that such a man as her husband would not keep her entirely exempt from excuses for resentment. The most remarkable of these bickerings was just as both came to their fortune. There was a misunderstanding about the custody of Prince Henry. He was in the hands of the Earl and Countess of Mar, with instructions not to give him up to any one. When Queen Anne was going to take her son to England, it appears that this instruction was read as a prohibition to give the child up even to his mother ; and the outrage was aggravated to her by a belief on her part, whether well founded or not, that her son was withheld from her custody as being unsafe on account of her dealings with Papists.

She was hard to be entreated in this affair, and even when reparation and apology were tendered, she continued to nurse her wrath. Her husband wrote her a letter of remonstrance on this occasion, so well toned that if we knew nothing else about its author we might pronounce him a wise and generous husband. He says : " I wonder that neither your long knowledge of my nature, nor my late earnest purgation unto you, can cure you of the rooted error that any living dare speak or inform me in anyways to your prejudice, or yet that ye can think they're your unfriends that are true servants to me. I can say no more, but protest, upon the peril of my salvation and damnation, that neither the Earl of Mar, nor any flesh living, ever informed me that ye was upon any Popish or Spanish course, or that ye had any other thoughts but a wrong-conceived opinion that he had more interest in your son, or would not deliver him unto you ; neither doth he farther charge the noblemen that was with you then, but that he was informed that some of them thought

to come out in a correspondence about a marriage of Prince Henry with one of the Medici family—a very hopeless effort, the prince having had a horror of Popery, and expressed his objection to a Popish wife with more distinctness than courtesy.

by force to have assisted you in the taking my son out of his hands : but as for any other Papist or foreign practice, by God, he doth not so much as allege it ; therefore he says he never will presume to accuse them, since it may happen well to import your offence. And therefore I say over again, leave these froward womanly apprehensions ; for I thank God I carry that love and respect unto you which by the law of God and nature I ought to do to my wife and mother of my children. But not for that ye are a king's daughter ; for whether ye were a king's or a cook's daughter, ye must be all alike to me, being once my wife. For the respect of your honourable birth and descent I married you ; but the love and respect I now bear you is because that ye are my married wife, and so partaker of my honours as of my other fortunes. I beseech you, excuse my rude plainness in this, for casting up your birth is a needless impertinent argument to me. God is my witness I ever preferred you to all my bairns, much more then to any subject. But if you will ever give place to the reports of every flattering sycophant that will persuade you that when I account well of an honest and wise servant for his true faithful service to me, that it is to compare or prefer him to you, then will neither ye or I be ever at rest or peace."¹

The queen's letters are generally written in a beautiful Italian hand, as legible as letterpress and almost as uniform. One, however, blotted and interlined, bears both in its aspect and its tenor the mark of passion. The bearer of it was Sir Roger Aston, and so far as it is legible it runs thus : "What I have said to Sir Roger is true. I could not but think it strange that any about your majesty durst presume to bring near where your majesty is one

¹ Letters to King James the Sixth from the Queen, Prince Henry, Prince Charles, the Princess Elizabeth, and her husband, Frederic, King of Bohemia, and from their son Prince Frederic Henry ; from the originals in the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, introduction, p. xxxi. The Seigneur de Beaumont, the ambassador from France to England, who remained at his post after the king's accession, took note of the continued resentment of the queen—"selon le naturel des femmes"—for the affront at Stirling.—Teulet (4to), iii. 709

that had offered me such a public scorn—for honour goes before life.”

Another short letter gives us a pleasanter touch of her character. It intercedes for the life of Raleigh, to whose singular accomplishments, including a knowledge of the pharmacy of the foreign schools, Queen Anne is said to have been indebted for relief from a painful disease. The letter is addressed to Buckingham, and one can feel that the writer must have blushed as the urgency of the occasion drove her into those terms of unseemly familiarity which her husband addressed to his favourite: “My kind doge, if I have any power or credit with you, I pray let me have a trial of it at this time in dealing sincerely and earnestly with the king, that Sir Walter Raleigh’s life may not be called in question. If you do it so that the success answer my expectation, assure yourself that I will take it extraordinary kindly at your hands; and rest one that wisheth you well, and desires you to continue still, as you have been, a true servant to your master.”

This was not the only occasion in which she interceded, and interceded in vain. King James was not a severe monarch; but where his own sacred person came into question, all vestiges of mercy fled from his heart, and nothing was too heavy a retribution to him who had been guilty of sacrilege against God’s vicegerent on earth. It was where he was thus personally concerned that the intercession of the gentle wife was the more seemly, but it was also where there was least hope. Thus in vain had she pleaded against the forfeitures which pursued the house of Gowrie with the unjust and pitiless vengeance that under the old dispensation punished the race for the crime of the man.

Let us look at still another specimen of her composition, as creditable to her head as the last is to her heart. It is supposed to allude to the marriage of the aged Earl of Nottingham to the youthful Lady Margaret Stewart. We can see that the writer lets fly an arrow of sharp wit, though we may not note the exact mark hit by it:—

“Your majesty’s letter was welcome to me. I have been as glad of the fair weather as yourself. The last

part of your letter you guessed right that I would laugh. Who would not laugh both at the persons and at the subject, but more at so well a chosen Mercury between Mars and Venus? You know that women can hardly keep counsel. I humbly desire your majesty to tell me how it is possible that I should keep this secret, that have already told it, and shall tell it to as many as I shall speak with; and if I were a poet, I would make a song of it, and sing it to the tune of 'Three fools well met.'"

This is from the collection of family letters already referred to. Those of the royal children go along with a few preserved elsewhere, to testify that they were a family with simple tastes, strongly attached to their parents and to each other. Prince Henry writes a Latin letter in a fine square Italian hand, designed to show his father what progress he has made in learning, being now in his seventh year. Prince Charles writes: "Sweete, sweete father, I learn to decline substantives and adjectives. Give me your blessing. I thank you for my best man.—Your loving son, YORK." In another collection there is this pleasant letter to his elder brother:—

"Sweet, sweet brother, I thank you for your letter. I will keep it better than all my graith, and I will send my pistols to Master Newton. I will give anything I have to you—both horse and my books, and my pieces and my crossbows, or anything that you would have. Good brother, love me, and I shall ever love and serve you.—Your loving brother to be commanded, YORK."

The collection of letters in the Advocates' Library is a well-kept memorial of a royal household. The paper is unstained and unworn. Each falls into its original folds. The wax impressions from the small finely-cut seals are as sharp as when the wax cooled, and the floss-silk adheres to each just as it was cut to open the letter. He who muses over them feels like one who is listening to the prattle of the nursery, while, endowed with the gift of prophecy, it is his sad privilege to anticipate the future of its innocent inmates, and see the dark troubled life and its bloody end.¹

¹ In the volume above referred to (p. 171) as printed for the Mait-VOL. V.

Prince Henry was the hope of both nations. People thought they saw revived in him the spirit of two gallant races—the Stewarts and the Guises. The prospect of so hopeful a successor did much among the English to apologise for the imperfections of the monarch in possession. When James departed for England he addressed a letter to his son, full of such good sense as he could always put upon paper when he was speaking of common things, and not preaching on the divine right of kings, witchcraft, the influence of tobacco, and other exciting topics. He says: “That I see you not before my parting impute it to this great occasion wherein time is so precious, but that shall, by God’s grace, be recompensed by your coming to me shortly, and continual residence with me ever after. Let not this news make you proud or insolent. A king’s son and heir was ye before, and nae mair are ye yet. The augmentation that is hereby like to fall unto you is but in cares and heavy burdens. Be therefore merry, but not insolent. Keep a greatness, but *sine fastu*. Be resolute, but not wilful. Keep your kindness, but in honourable sort. Choose nane to be your playfellows but them that are well born. And above all things give never good countenance to any but according as ye are informed that they are in estimation with me. Look upon all Englishmen that shall come to visit you as upon your loving subjects, not with that ceremony as towards

land Club the letters are given in facsimile. They belong to the collection made by Sir James Balfour, Lord Lyon, a celebrated legal antiquary of the middle of the seventeenth century. A facsimile of a selected portion of the letters is in Part III. of the historical documents issued by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland. The letters, other than those in the Balfour collection, referred to in the text, are to be found in the introduction to the Maitland volume.

If it be asked why these trifling personal details, inconsistent with the fabric of other parts of this work, are now introduced, the excuse is in the opportunity. We cannot see an interior from a distance. The author has been reproached for omitting personal anecdotes about the earlier monarchs, but he omitted them because he did not find them in the materials on which he relied. Even in Queen Mary’s life, much as it has been pried into, we have little of the domesticities. Now, for the first time, we are permitted to step into the monarch’s abode, and we look about us.

strangers, and yet with such heartiness as at this time they deserve."

The king left behind for the use of his son that manual of conduct set forth for his guidance under the title of 'Basilikon Doron,' or the royal gift. It was presented with this commendation: "I send you herewith my book lately printed. Study and profit in it as ye would deserve my blessing; and as there can nathing happen unto you whereof ye will not find the general ground therein, if not the very particular point touched, so maun ye level every man's opinions or advices unto you as ye find them agree or discord with the rules there set down,—allowing and following their advices that agrees with the same, mistrusting and frowning upon them that advises you to the contrary."¹

Prince Henry gained golden opinions from the English by his ardent devotion to athletic pastimes. In Scotland these were never popular. Ever poor, and ever struggling for national existence, perhaps the amount of real earnest work, involving toil, hardship, and danger, extinguished any taste for amateur indulgence in such excitements. The people could fight when they saw an enemy, and could hunt down wild animals for food; but they had no turn for tilting or hunting in sport. But Prince Henry went heartily and thoroughly into the English humour. A contemporary tells us, that besides hunting and tilting, "his other exercises were dancing, leaping, and, in times of year fit for it, learning to swim; at some times walking fast and far, to accustom and enable himself to make a long march when time should require it; but most of all at tennis-play, wherein, to speak the truth, which in all things I especially effect, he neither observed moderation nor what appertained to his dignity and person, continuing oftentimes his play for the space of three or four hours, and the same in his shirt, rather becoming an artisan than a prince."² He endeav-

¹ Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), introduction, 28.

² Cornwallis's "Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince Henry;" cited, Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 36.

oured to introduce among the English the game of golf, one of the few pastimes for the adult which had been followed in Scotland. It may be likened to open-air billiards played on the turf instead of the table. An anecdote was preserved, in which the prince, being warned that by the stroke he was going to take he might hit his tutor, said, "Had I done so, I had but paid my debts."

He was accustomed to speak with vehement distaste of Popery. He was hence the great champion and hope of the Protestant party, and it is to his holding this ecclesiastical position that we may attribute the dark rumours about foul play that attended his early death. In after-times he was counted among the happy who died young, and are spared the evil days in store for them. But on the other hand it was said, that had he lived it would have been to change the face of history. The same was said in later times when the son of Louis XV. died in boyhood, and ever will be said when a popular heir to great destinies dies before he reaches his kingdom, and so hands it over to another in whose hands it is shipwrecked. The national loss was portended by supernatural appearances in the elements: "On Thursday evening appeared a fatal sign, about two hours or more within the night, bearing the colours and show of a rainbow, which hung directly across over St James's House. It was first perceived about seven o'clock at night, which I myself did see, with divers others looking thereupon with admiration, continuing till past bed-time, being no more seen."¹ The Earl of Dorset, writing to a friend about the evil news, expressed the national feeling in saying: "To tell you that our rising sun is set ere scarce he had shone, and that all our glory lies buried, you know and lament as well as we, and more truly, or else you were not a man and sensible of this kingdom's loss."²

The loss was the more perceptible that his younger brother Charles had been a puny child, both his body and mind lingering behind the advance proper to his

¹ Cornwallis's "Discourse of the Most Illustrious Prince Henry;" cited, Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 39.

² Ibid.

years. Sir Robert Carey, who was much trusted by the royal family, though not their kinsman as he was Elizabeth's, says of him: "When I was at Norham God put it in my mind to go to Dunfermline to see the king's second son. I found him a very weak child." He says: "There were many great ladies suitors for the keeping of the duke; but when they did see how weak a child he was, and not likely to live, their hearts were down, and none of them was desirous to take charge of him." Hence the prize fell more easily to the lot of Carey and his wife, who had sufficient courage. "The duke," he continues, "was past four years old when he was first delivered to my wife. He was not able to go, nor scant stand alone, he was so weak in his joints, and especially his ankles, inso-much as many feared they were out of joint; yet God so blessed him both with health and strength, that he proved daily stronger and stronger. Many a battle my wife had with the king, but she still prevailed. The king was desirous that the string under his tongue should be cut, for he was so long beginning to speak as he thought he would never have spoken. Then he would have him put in iron boots to strengthen his sinews and joints. My wife had the charge of him from a little past four till he was almost eleven years old, in all which time he daily grew more and more in health and strength, both in body and mind, to the amazement of many who knew his weakness when she first took charge of him."¹

On the 30th of May 1603, just when James had settled down in his new dominion, the Lord Fyvie, evidently trying to make the best of a poor story, reported of the boy: "Your sacred majesty's most noble son Duke Charles continues, praised be God, in good health, good courage, and lofty mind, although yet weak in body; is beginning to speak some words—far better as yet of his mind and tongue nor of his body and feet. But I hope in God he shall be all well and princely, worthy of your majesty, as his grace is judged by all very like in lineaments to your royal person."² A year and a few months

¹ Memoirs, 137 *et seq.*

² Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 33.

later, in January 1604, we are told: "On Twelfth-Day we had the creation of Duke Charles, now Duke of York. The interim was entertained with making Knights of the Bath, which was three days' work. They were eleven in number besides the little duke, all of the king's choice. The solemnity of the creation was kept in the hall, where first the duke was brought in, accompanied by his knights; then carried out again, and brought back by earls in their robes of the garter. My lord admiral bare him, two others went as supporters, and six marched before with the ornaments. The patent was read by my Lord Cranbourne, and drawn in most elegant law Latin by Mr Attorney; but so we have a Duke of York in title, but not in substance."¹ Such are the notices we have of the first acquaintance of the English people with a prince destined to fill a memorable and tragic place in their history.

There was still another royal child whose career was to be eventful and sad, and to be far away from the country both of her childhood and of her youth. Her husband's election to the throne of Bohemia, the disastrous conflict brought on him by this distinction, and the misfortunes of the family, are part of the history of the Thirty Years' War. In British history the Princess Elizabeth must be ever remembered as the ancestress of the royal line, since her grandson, the son of her daughter, the Electress Sophia, was the first king of the British empire under the final adjustment made by the Act of Settlement. She was the mother, too, of Prince Rupert, the hero of the cavaliers in the great civil war. Elizabeth's career in life was restless and uncomfortable, not only through the political troubles which beset her husband, but through her own caprice and wilfulness. Her letters, however, in the family collection, have little in them but dry business and decorum. They are written in a beautiful Italian hand; and she selects in them the English language, the French, and the Italian, as one at home in all.²

¹ Sir Dudley Carleton to Secretary Winwood; Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 46. The adept in "law Latin" was the great Coke.

² A letter by her eldest son, Frederic Henry, to King James, is a

Such are a few of the leading characteristics that have reached us of the royal family transferred from Scotland to England through the union of the crowns. When it happens, as sometimes it does,—that on the death of some man of vast wealth, the genealogical detectives find his nearest relation, and the heir of his possessions, in a common workman, supplying by his daily toil a sordid sustenance to his family—the contrast of the first and the last part of the man's life can scarcely be greater than that between James King of Scotland, and James King of “England, Scotland, France, and Ireland.” In the end, for all the doubts and difficulties besetting the succession, the new king owed a great debt of gratitude to Queen Elizabeth. She had disciplined the Court into thorough subjection and adoration, and he reaped where she had sown; for no man was less fitted to create such a paradise, and no man better suited to enjoy it when it fell to his lot. The heart of the English constitution was sound; and the gentry, peasantry, and citizens retained many items of old Saxon freedom which were thought not to exist because they were not put to the test in Elizabeth's day. All the world knows how effectually they came into action at the hour of trial. But while the public liberties were not disturbed, every one who went to Court knew that he must accept the position of living under an absolute despotism. Perhaps, from some natural touch of chivalry, the delusion was more readily helped because the despot to be obeyed and the idol to be worshipped was a woman. The reverence to the sovereign might partake of the homage to the sex. However it arose, it was endowed with system and decorum, and had certainly an aspect less repulsive than it assumed when the ungainly male figure floundered among the doctrines

fitting companion to the baby productions of his uncles contained in the same collation: “Sir, I kiss your hand. I would fain see your majesty. I can say *nominativo, hic, hæc, hoc*, and all five declensions, and a part of *pronomem* and a part of *verbum*. I have two horses alive that can goe up my staires, a black horse and a chesnut. I pray God to bless your majesty.—Your majesty's obedient grand-child,
FREDERIC HENRY.”

and usages of divine right. Courtiers trained in this school came for him, and attended him to his new home, taking care that on the way everything should nourish and nothing should dispel the atmosphere of obedience and worship that surrounded the representative of God on earth.

If we can believe a story of the time, indeed, the law of England was outraged in the nourishment of this notion. It is told how a pickpocket, or "cut-purse," according to the nomenclature of the day, having been caught pursuing his profession in the throng that accompanied the royal progress, King James sent him to the recorder of Newark-on-Trent, with an order or warrant that he should be hanged; and he was duly hanged accordingly. The reproach of this act has curiously enough been cast upon the law and constitution of Scotland. A succession of commenters on it have argued that the king must have been accustomed in his old dominion to order offenders for execution without trial. Had his order been disobeyed on the south side of the Border, there had been more reason for this view, but the story says it was obeyed. It is certain that the king enjoyed no such power in Scotland; and the fairer inference, were the story undoubted, would be that the flattering speeches of the courtiers taught him to believe that in England he was to be an absolute monarch. The story, however, requires more support than the original evidence gives it. It is one of the many things believed on account of reiterated assertion and the quantity of controversy that clouds it; for in the troubles of the next reign this was cited as the first arbitrary act of the Stewarts, showing the nature of the political doctrines which they had brought with them from Scotland; and the pickpocket became the proto-martyr of the persecutions which provoked the great civil war and the revolution.¹

¹ The contemporary account of the affair is: "In this town, and in the Court, was taken a cut-purse doing the deed; and being a base pilfering thief, yet was a gentleman like in the outside. This fellow had good store of coin found about him; and upon examination confessed that he had from Berwick to that place played the

cut-purse in the Court. His fellow was ill missed, for no doubt he had a walking mate : they drew together like coach-horses, and it is pity they did not hang together ; for his majesty, hearing of this nimbling gallant, directed a warrant presently to the recorder of Newark to have him hanged, which was accordingly executed.”—“Narrative of the Progresse and Entertainment of the King’s Most Excellent Majestie, with the Occurrents happening in the same Journey ;” Nichols, i. 89. The comments on the event are chiefly by writers of a later period, but it is right to mention that one contemporary critic alludes to it. Sir John Harington says : “I hear our new king hath hanged ane man before he was tried ; ’tis strangely done. Now if the wind bloweth thus, why may not a man be tried before he hath offended ?”—Nugæ Antiquæ, i. 180. This is in a wailing letter, in which he says : “Here now will I rest my troubled mind, and tend my sheep like an Arcadian swain that hath lost his fair mistress ; for in sooth I have lost the best and fairest love that ever shepherd knew, even my gracious queen ; and sith my good mistress is gone, I shall not hastily put forth for a new master.” Some said his wailing and discontent arose from the cold reception of his offers of service to the new king, although he had made his advances in the preceding winter, by sending him a New-Year’s gift of a rather peculiar kind—“a dark lantern made of four metals, gold, silver, brass, and iron. The top of it was a crown of pure gold, which also did serve to cover a perfume pan.”—Ibid. Of this odd gift the editor of the Nugæ says : “This *laterna secreta* was evidently fabricated at a moment when the lamp of life grew dim in the frame of Queen Elizabeth, and she began to bear show of human infirmity.” Thus sent to King James before he was the giver’s king, there was a jocularly irreverently unscrupulous in the motto inscribed on the gift in the words of “the good theife,” “Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thie kingdom.”—Ibid., 325, 326. These things are curious, because Sir John Harington is among the most bitter of the writers who exposed the weaknesses of the new king and his favourites.

CHAPTER LXIII.

JAMES VI.

POLITICAL CONDITIONS FOLLOWING ON THE UNION OF THE CROWNS—EFFECT OF THE REMOVAL OF THE COURT—RESORT OF THE SCOTS TO ENGLAND—THE POPULAR CHARGES AGAINST THEM OF BEGGARY, GREED, AND FILTH—QUESTION HOW FAR THESE ARE JUSTIFIED—ADDITION TO ENGLAND OF INDUSTRIOUS INHABITANTS—PROJECT OF INCORPORATING UNION—REPEAL OF ANTAGONISTIC LAWS—THE GREAT CASE OF THE *POSTNATI*, OR RIGHT OF PERSONS BORN AFTER THE UNION TO COMMON CITIZENSHIP—MORAL EFFECT OF THE DECISION—LORD BACON ON THE QUESTION—NAVIGATION RESTRICTIONS—LOCAL AFFAIRS IN SCOTLAND—THE DISCOVERIES ABOUT THE GOWRIE CONSPIRACY—REVELATIONS OF SPROT—LOGAN OF RESTALRIG.

HAVING thus seen the family to their new home, let us leave them in the hands of the historians of England, and return to Scotland.

I was only by slow degrees that the union of the crowns influenced the domestic condition of Scotland; but in the foreign relations which have heretofore held so large a share of our History, the event was an epoch. England had now at all events ceased to be the natural enemy. With the enmity of England came also to an end the friendly relations with France. The ancient league existed in the letter, but was dead in spirit. It may be said that these conditions arose in 1573, when Edinburgh Castle was gained for the regency and Queen Mary's party was extinguished. As it happened, the old quarrels did not break forth, and the old ally was not courted; but all the elements existed, which might at any

time start into life in the shape of the old troubles ; and throughout the thirty intervening years all men had to stand prepared for such an event.

This condition of suspense was now at an end. No doubt Scotland was still an independent kingdom, which might have a quarrel and a war with England ; but the chances of such an event had been infinitely reduced. Causes of offence were to arise, and wars were to follow ; but, by a strange conjunction of causes, they were to divide each of the nations into two antagonistic bodies, instead of setting the two kingdoms at war with each other as of old. The preponderance in favour of peace lay in this, that it was difficult to suppose a case in which the king's advisers in Scotland would not act in harmony with his advisers in England. Thus, whereas of old the whole nation, with the king's Government at its head, broke out in hostility to England, such hostility would now be limited to the opposition, and the power of England would help the Government of Scotland in suppressing it.

The event did not touch the national institutions of Scotland, and thus there were none of the causes of irritation and national jealousy which troubled the promoters of the union of the Governments in 1707. We shall afterwards see that interference with national affairs did arise, and what effect it had. In the mean time, that their king had gone to rule over their "auld enemy of England" was rather a matter of pride than of mortification to the Scots. He was not an affluent king in his own country ; and the loss of the Court expenditure was a trifle felt perhaps by the traders immediately concerned, but more than compensated to the nation. To the country generally, indeed, the absence of a regal Court was a relief ; for it was the absence of a household which had to be maintained by feudal exactions and virtually enforced hospitalities.

It was not as at the incorporating union, when the seat of Legislature and a great part of the Government business were transferred to London, taking with them a body of the wealthiest men in the kingdom. Such of the nobility and landed gentry of Scotland as could decently support themselves had no occasion to go to London, nor would

such a movement have been consistent with their habits. It was not necessary that the town-house of a Scots lord or laird should even be in the capital of his own country. In Perth, St Andrews, Aberdeen, Elgin, and other towns, stood the winter town-homes of many of the neighbouring landowners; and the small town of Maybole, in Ayrshire, still contains, as capital of Carrick, the seemly hotels of the Kennedies, who were supreme in that old province.

Notoriously the Scots who flocked to England went to acquire, not to spend, and were the cause of more gain than loss to their country. There was much bad blood between Englishman and Scot; but it did not show itself in Scotland, for the English did not go thither. In England the Scots were well abused and scorned. One of the standing reproaches against them was their dirt. It has long been part of the social creed of the true-born Englishman, that he alone is clean, all the rest of the world being dirty. Holland claimed the same supremacy, and with a better title, since it could rebuke England. Erasmus, speaking of the sweating sickness, pointed to the bed of rushes on the Englishman's floor, which lay rotting for years, while it received pollutions shocking to the sight and nose of the fastidious Dutchman. For a long time, no doubt, England may be counted far above the average of the European nations in physical purity of living; but travellers know that there are other communities equally repellent of filth in parts of the world where one would least expect it to be so. At the present day, Scotland, in this as in many other social matters, differs little from England, unless the traveller take his estimate of the whole country from the Western Highlands.

There must, however, have been some difference in the seventeenth century to justify the proverbiality of the Scot for uncleanness. It was imputed, whether with exact truth or not, to people of the highest rank. The Lady Clifford notes in her diary a visit to the new Court in the year of its arrival: "We all went to Tibbalds to see the king, who used my mother and my aunt very graciously; but we all saw a great change between the fashion of the Court as it was now, and that in the queen's, for we were

all lowsy by sitting in Sir Thomas Erskine's chamber."¹ Weldon had visited the stream of Scots filth at its source; and in the "Perfect Description of Scotland," which brought him into trouble, he described it with an expressiveness that makes quotation perilous when he dwells on particulars. After such generalities as "pride is a thing bred in their bones, and their flesh naturally abhors cleanliness," and "the ointments they most frequently use amongst them are brimstone and butter for the scab," he concludes with this achievement of courtly ribaldry: "The men of old did no more wonder that the great Messiah should be born in so poor a town as Bethlehem in Judea, than I do wonder that so brave a prince as King James should be born in so stinking a town as Edinburgh, in lowsy Scotland."² It is possible that it may have been for this redeeming touch that its author obtained a private pension, when he was driven from his public office because he had maligned his majesty's ancient kingdom.

The other and more substantial reproach against the Scots who follow the Court was, that they were a swarm of mendicants come to feed on the wealth of England. At the Court their partial countryman on the throne was to give them all the good things. The author just quoted says: "Now also the English faction, seeing they could not sever the Scots from him, endeavoured to raise a mutiny against the Scots who were his supporters, their agents divulging everywhere the Scots would get all and beggar the kingdom. The Scots, on the other side, complained to the king they were so poor they underwent the by-word of beggarly Scots; to which the king returned this answer, as he had a very ready wit,—'Content yourself; I will shortly make the English as beggarly as you, and so end that controversy.'"³

This refers to the favours of the Court; and it was quite natural that where the honours and emoluments deemed to be the peculiar harvest of the English aris-

¹ Letters, &c. (Maitland Club), 52.

² Secret History, ii. 89.

³ Ibid., i. 370.

tocracy were given to Scotsmen, there should be murmurs. There were a few flagrant instances of Scotsmen thus offensively advanced, as Ker, Earl of Somerset, and Hay, Lord Doncaster. The few other peerages given to Scotsmen were chiefly to men who already held the rank of Lord in the Estates of Parliament of their own country. But the favours of the Court were the reward of but a percentage of the Scots who flocked southward when the way was opened to them. Their great offence was that they had a turn for prospering, and all that they gained in the process was set down to the loss of England. Could there be a fitting of accounts between nations, the balance at that time would have been heavily against England, setting down on the debit side all that had been done for the impoverishment of the Scots from the destruction of their mercantile capital, Berwick, down to Somerset's invasion. But following the now-accepted doctrines of political economy, it is unnecessary to open such an account. The man who enriches himself by honest industry and enterprise does not impoverish others by the process, but makes his neighbours participators in his success. It is the immigrant who remains a pauper who is a burden to the country of his adoption, not he who prospers.

Even the pungent satirist just cited, when he comes to particulars, cannot run up a very formidable score against the hungry invaders, or entirely acquit his countrymen of participation in the plunder:—

“It is true that many Scots did get much, but not more with one hand than they spent with the other—witness the Earl of Kelly, Annandale, &c. ; nay, that great getter the Earl of Carlisle also, and some private gentlemen, as Sir Gideon Murray, John Achmouty, James Bailie, John Gib, and Barnard Lindlay, got some petty estates not worth either the naming or envying: old servants should get some moderate estates to leave to posterity.

“But these and all the Scots in general get scarce a tithe of those English getters that can be said did stick by them or their posterity. Besides, Salisbury had one trick to get the kernel, and leave the Scots but the shell,

yet cast all the envy on them. He would make them buy books of fee-farms, some one hundred pounds per annum, some one hundred marks, and he would compound with them for a thousand pounds; which they were willing to embrace, because they were sure to have them pass without any control or charge; and one thousand pounds appeared, to them that never saw ten pounds before, an inexhaustible treasure. Then would Salisbury fill up this book with such prime land as should be worth ten or twenty thousand pounds, which was easy for him, being treasurer, so to do; and by this means Salisbury enriched himself infinitely, yet cast the envy on the Scots, in whose name these books appeared, and are still upon record to all posterity; though Salisbury had the money—they, poor gentlemen, but part of the wax.”¹

The Crown lands were then and long afterwards a fruitful means of jobbing, or, as it might perhaps be more correctly called, peculating. The trick here described seems to be, that when some needy Scot was favoured with a profitable investment in a holding—for which he had, however, to pay out a sum which he could ill afford—the Treasurer, who had the making of the bargain, and made it profitable, bought it up for a sum in cash paid down.

England was opened as a field of enterprise for the exertions of the poor Scots by the same event which shut them out of their old market in France. Among the many lampoons on the prosperous Scots, one has been preserved, which, being clever and not venomous, is really descriptive:—

“Bonny Scot, we all witness can
That England hath made thee a gentleman.
Thy blue bonnet, when thou came hither,
Could scarce keep out the wind and weather;
But now it is turned to a hat and feather:
Thy bonnet is blown—the devil knows whither.

Thy shoes on thy feet, when thou camest from plough,
Were made of the hide of an old Scotch cow;

¹ Secret History, i. 372, 373,

But now they are turned to a rare Spanish leather,
And decked with roses altogether.

Thy sword at thy [back] was a great black blade,
With a great basket-hilt of iron made :
But now a long rapier doth hang by his side,
And huffingly doth this bonny Scot ride.
Bonny Scot, we all witness can
That England hath made thee a gentleman."

The modern poor-law policy is to keep out of the union the stranger likely to become chargeable. There is no parish war against a settlement by persons whose career promises to be that of the "bonny Scot." And in fact England suffered no material harm by the union of the crowns, and gained the material profit of finding it no longer necessary to the honour of the English crown to subdue a country which repeated costly efforts had proved to be unsubduable.

That the Scots who migrated to England met with inhospitable sarcasm, did not disturb the equanimity of their brethren who remained at home. The only prominent allusion to the matter is in certain proclamations of the Scots Council, not complaining of the conduct of the English, but denouncing those Scots who went among them in such fashion as to bring their country to shame. One such document sets out with the preamble, how "the frequent and daily resort of great numbers of idle persons, men and women of base sort and condition, and without any certain trade, calling, or dependence, going from hence to Court by sea and land, is not only very unpleasant and offensive to the king's majesty, in so far as he is daily importuned with their suits and begging, and his royal Court almost filled with them, they being, in the opinion and conceit of all beholders, but idle rascals and poor miserable bodies; but with that this country is heavily disgraced, and many slanderous imputations given out against the same, as if there were no persons of good rank, comeliness, or credit within the same." One of these proclamations especially complains that some of these "idle rascals and poor miserable bodies" go to solicit the king for payment of debts incurred to them by

his Court when in Scotland; which is described as "of all kinds of importunity the maist unpleasing to his majesty." The remedy is, that the owners of vessels and their skippers and mariners are not to remove passengers to England unless such as can be reported to have a lawful errand, "or are licensed by the Council."

After the accession of King James to the crown of England, the first political event in which Scotland was concerned was a project for an incorporating union of the kingdoms. On the English side it came on with a sort of impetuous haste. The first statute of the reign being an acknowledgment of the king's right of succession, the second is "An Act authorising certain commissioners of England to treat with commissioners of Scotland for the weal of both kingdoms." It was a project of the king's own, and he alone seems to have heartily promoted it. He does not appear to have had much conception of the difficulties in front of such a project. By the union of the crowns those only who went across the Border felt the pressure of the alien institutions of their neighbours; but in an incorporating union there must of necessity be much giving and taking. This is a process difficult as between friends, but here it was to be between bitter enemies. There were those alive in Scotland who remembered when Hereford burnt Edinburgh, and left as far as the Forth a desert dirty with blood and smoke. Though they were under one king, each country held the other to be alien, and to be of all alien countries the most hated by reason of its nearness. Those parts of each which were nearest—the Borders—hated each other the most. The Statute-book of each country was filled with hostile laws against the inhabitants of the other.

The attempt to carry an incorporating union at that time was, as every reader knows, unsuccessful. A hundred years later, when the old national enmities had time to be forgotten, and separate interests, with their attendant rivalries and jealousies, alone remained, even these were sufficient to make the task of incorporation a tough one. A full statement of the details of such a process is not always popular with readers, even when it has proved

successful ; and it would be useless to burden history with the narrative of an unsuccessful attempt of the kind, unless it were found to contain incidents remarkable or important in themselves. We have nothing, however, but unavailing details of projects, Parliamentary conferences, minutes of the negotiations and resolutions at conferences, reports by the heads of departments, and the other rather forbidding materials which might be expected from those who are deeply engaged in the preliminaries of a great contract of partnership. It will be sufficient, perhaps, just to touch in passing one or two political features of the transaction which seem worth noting.

The negotiation went so far as the appointment of commissioners on either side, and they met for the transaction of business. The commissioners for England were chosen by the two houses in conference, those for Scotland by the Estates. For the Union of 1707, the Parliament of each country authorised the Crown to appoint the commissioners under the great seal of each kingdom.

It was in England that King James and his supporters chiefly busied themselves about the project—Scotland was comparatively passive. It helps us to understand the tone and temper in which English statesmen discussed it, to remember that they firmly believed, though they must not publicly say, that Scotland was by law a dependence of the English crown. The proposal was distinctly treated as an unequal union. It was proposed that the new State thus formed by consolidation should be called “Great Britain.” The king himself took credit for this suggestion. He was vain of it ; and this feeling might have been justified could he have foreseen how great a name it was to become in modern times. When he found himself thwarted as to the actual substance of the treaty, he tried how far he could adopt the new name by the force of the prerogative, arguing that no doubt each nation was independent of the other, but he, as king of both, was King of the Island of Great Britain, and entitled so to call and demean himself. He issued a proclamation, to the effect that “as our imperial monarchy of these two great kingdoms doth comprehend the whole island, with

the dependencies and pertinents of the same, so it shall keep in all ensuing ages the united denomination of the invincible monarchy of Great Britain ; and therefore, by the force of our royal prerogative, we assume to ourselves the style and title of King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, as our just and lawful style, to be used in all proclamations, missives, treaties, leagues, dedications, impressions, and all cases of the like nature, in time coming ; discharging and discontinuing the several names of Scotland and England to be expressed in legal proceedings, instruments, and assurances of particular parties.”¹ In England there was a decided objection to a new name. The proper name of the nation was old and honoured. A new empire called Britain would have no precedents to fix its position among nations, and would be dishonoured for its novelty. Such an abandonment of an old national name was unknown among States. The method by which great States brought small ones into union was conquest, and the smaller State was absorbed into and increased the power of the larger.

The real contest lay between the king and the Parliament of England. The aspect of Scotland was more that of attention than of action, as if the country waited until there was a practical call for her acceptance or refusal. So the chief manifestations of feeling there, were in retaliation of any contumely or slight cast on the country from the other side. If England had a great name, such a sacrifice was not all hers. Scotland had her own heroic reputation, and a far older nationality. On the side of England there was of course much grumbling about the admission of their poor neighbours to the affluent foreign trade. The influential alliances by which this trade was furthered were special to England, and would not belong to the newly-constructed kingdom. But Scotland, too, had her alliances with the trading communities of the north, and among these with the newly-constructed State of the United Provinces. But here there opened a consideration which was not a mere plea adapted for diplo-

¹ Bruce's Report, Appendix No. xiv.

matic fencing, but a difficulty and danger all too real—what was to become of the ancient league with France, if Scotland became one and indivisible with France's natural enemy? True, it had not of late been an active alliance offensive and defensive; but who could foretell the fate of poor Scotland left in the embraces of that powerful foe whom she had kept for centuries at a distance?

The prospect held out by a free internal trade to the two parties still alien, was of course an important point. It brought out theories that in their own day were considered full of practical wisdom, and in the present would only be referred to, like tales of sorcery and witchcraft, as instances of the boundless capacity of human folly. Scotland was poor, and on any conditions would prove a shabby customer at the great wareroom of England. But the poor country had no exportable produce which could go towards balancing accounts of imports and exports. There was therefore this consolation, that what little the poor country did buy must be paid for in hard cash.

A common claim by the inhabitants of both countries to the public offices in both was another serious anticipation. If the emoluments of these offices were looked to as simple property, without any reference to the value of the services to be rendered in return, then no doubt England would be a loser by the transaction which admitted the Scots to hold office in England, giving as equivalent to Englishmen a due share of the wretched patronage of their country. The disparity was peculiarly conspicuous in the two Churches, since that of England possessed the bulk of the old ecclesiastical property of the secular clergy, while the wealth of the old Romish hierarchy of Scotland had gone, all but a wretched pittance, into lay hands. The English seem to have bethought them of a plan for striking off the chief prizes on their own side, so as to reduce what they gave to something near to par with what Scotland had to render in return. So in certain considerations offered by the Commons to the Lords in conference, the part relating to Church patronage contained "a reservation, a grant, and a caution." Thus: "The reservation is of all bishoprics. That no Scotsman may be a bishop,

because, as bishops, they sit in Parliament, and that every bishop hath under him a place of judicature. The like reservation of masterships or headships of colleges and houses (for the universities are contained under the ecclesiastical) in both universities, that no Scotsman be master or head of a college or house.

"The grant is, That of all other dignities, benefices, or preferments, they should be capable of one-tenth part at the most.

"The cautions were, No Scotsman shall be capable of two dignities or two benefices, or above one dignity and one benefice."¹

The discussion on the distribution of offices touched King James somewhat keenly, as he was under suspicion of unduly favouring his countrymen in the use of his official patronage. On this point, when the project had reached the appointment of the commission, he wrote a letter to Lord Cranbourne, so fussy and full of his own complacent self-conceit, that it may be given in full as a vivid specimen of his style of correspondence and of statesmanship:—

"My little Beagle,—Now that, God be praised, this session of the commissioners hath had so happy a success, to the end that the commissioners of England, and by them the whole people of England, may discern the true difference between a crafty tyrant and a just king, I will now, after the conclusion of this point of the naturalisation, open my mind freelier therein than ever I would have done before it had been agreed upon; whereas a tyrant would but have given fair words till he had gotten his turn done, and then but have kept his promise as he had thought convenient. First, therefore, I protest, in God's presence, never Scotsman did, either directly or indirectly make suit to me for any such preferment as is referred to in your Act; and whether they ever had or not, God is my judge, I was ever rooted in that firm resolution, never to have placed Scotsmen in any such room till first time had begun to wear away that opinion of different

¹ Bruce's Report, Appendix No. xx.

nations; and secondly, that this jealous apprehension of the Union had been worn away; and thirdly, that Scotsmen had been brought up here at the foot of Gamaliel. And when all this were done, I would ever, all my life, prefer an Englishman to a Scotsman for any such place, *cæteris paribus*; and would ever wish my successors after me to do the like, as my book to my son bears witness. Nay, though I knew a Scotsman, for a miracle, that were more capable for any such place than any Englishman in England, yet shall I never be that greedy of Scotsmen's preferment as to prefer any by whom occasion might be given of the least discontentment to the people here. I am not ignorant, nor void of means enow to show my thankfulness to my subjects of Scotland, without any such preferments; and therefore, after that in my name you have given my most hearty thanks to all your fellow-commissioners for their tender and reverent regard for the preservation of my prerogative, and for the loving affection they have shown to that nation whom amongst I was born—whereof by their proceeding now they have given a most clear demonstration—let them hereby be informed that I was moved upon two regards to wish the Act to be as generally and favourably conceived as I must confess now it is. First, that in my own nature I ever love to be as little bound by any conditions as can be, and loves ever to promise fairly and perform fully; and next, that Scotland may see that I ever reserve to myself that fulness of power to bestow such degrees of favour upon them as they shall be able from time to time to deserve. And thus having freely discharged my mind of the burthen of my thoughts in this point, I am heartily contented that not only you read this letter in the public audience of all the commissioners, but that also it be reserved in the register of your actions for a perpetual memory, as well of my honest sincerity as of my thankfulness towards you, as well for the expressing of your dutiful regard towards me as of your loving affections towards my Scottish subjects, now your countrymen. And thus I bid you heartily farewell.”¹

¹ Bruce's Report, Appendix No. xvi.

This project had but a languid existence. On the 6th of December 1604, there was a distinct step taken in "Articles agreed by the commissioners to be propounded to the Parliaments of both kingdoms at next sessions."¹ But it was not until the year 1606 that the conditions so suggested received a full discussion. Of this nothing practical came, and the project gradually dropped out of the Parliamentary proceedings of both countries; for neither of them was very anxious for the incorporation. King James felt in this affair that England was not that paradise of arbitrary power which the ways of the Court seemed to promise to him. If he had not the plots and contentions of the fierce Scots to trouble him, he had another difficulty harder to be conquered. He had come from a stage where rapid changes followed each other, and violent passions took their swing. He was now to encounter the solemn conservative spirit of English political life, where all things that moved at all went forward with solemn march, keeping as near as possible to old precedent. The passive difficulties in the way of his project fairly tired him out, while the Gunpowder Plot and other exciting events gave food for his attention.

The discussions were not entirely lost when the question of a union came up at a time better fitted for completing so great a work. Every artist knows the advantage of seeing a half-finished attempt to accomplish the project he is going to begin. Many internal difficulties which

¹ It is in these articles that the tenor of the project is given to be inferred, and the document is therefore an important State paper. It forms No. xv. in the Appendix in Bruce's Report, though there it is not printed at full length, documentary matter incorporated in it being referred to as printed elsewhere, for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary reprinting. This document would of course be made out in duplicate, one for each country. Until recently, neither of these was known to exist, but the duplicate for Scotland, in the General Register House, has now been made available by Mr Thomas Dickson, the successor to Dr Joseph Robertson as curator of the historical department in that establishment. The existence of this duplicate is eminently satisfactory, as no one can anticipate the doubts that may be cast on any State paper existing only in the shape of a copy. A facsimile of it, with all its signatures, has a worthy place in the third collection of "National Manuscripts" issued by the Lord Clerk Register.

could only be anticipated by men in open discussion on a practical question were minutely criticised and examined, and then lay over, for the events and discussions of a century either to find how they should be solved or to remove their causes.

It is curiously instructive to find that this same starting and examination of difficulties is almost the only practical service which those who professed to work in the furtherance and discussion of the project left to those who were to resume it in later times. The incapacity of the speculator to anticipate with any degree of exactness the shape in which projects for the regulation of mankind will actually work, is one of those humiliations of human genius which enable the plodding practical mind which knows little beyond what it sees, to laugh at the philosopher who dips into the future. The limits of the capacity of men to anticipate the absolute result of measures for the government of their species is signally shown in our own day, when an age of extreme legislative interference has been succeeded by an age of undoing what had been done. If there was an instance when the practical of the future could be unveiled, surely it was in these union discussions, since their aridity is relieved by a noble speech of Bacon in furtherance of the measure. He had just begun his great ascent by appointment to the office of Solicitor-General. His obsequiousness to the Court would be sufficient to induce him to aid the king's favourite measure, while his wisdom and wit would supply the reasons for supporting it. It might seem a grand opportunity for testing the power of practical anticipation, that we should have a hundred and sixty years' experience of the effect of a union before us, and should be able to compare this with the anticipations of the greatest intellect of an intellectual age—an intellect, too, in which the true and the practical were so largely dominant.

But there is nothing to be got by such a comparison. The speech is conceived in the speaker's lofty and pensive eloquence. A fine spirit of liberal and tolerant thought pervades it, along with a contempt for paltry difficulties and illiberal prejudices. But the reader misses

any practical grasp of the actual effect which a union is to have on the destinies of the two nations and of their individual citizens. For instance, take the following: "The third objection is some inequality in the fortunes of these two nations, England and Scotland, by the commixture whereof there may ensue advantage to them and loss to us; wherein, Mr Speaker, it is well that this difference or disparity consisteth but in the external goods of fortune. For indeed it must be confessed, that for the goods of the mind and body they are *alteri nos*, or ourselves; for to do them but right, we know in their capacities and understandings they are a people ingenious, in labour industrious, in courage valiant, in body hard, active, and comely. More might be said, but in commending them we do but in effect commend ourselves, for they are of one part and continent with us; and the truth is, we are participant both of their virtues and vices. For if they have been noted to be a people not so tractable in government, we cannot, without flattering ourselves, free ourselves altogether from that fault, being indeed incident to all martial people, as we see it evident by the example of the Romans and others; even like unto fierce horses, that though they be of better service than others, yet are they harder to guide and manage."¹

Though this project of an incorporating union came to nought, yet the discussions opened by it suggested a concession simple in its nature, yet very effective in preparing the countries for incorporation. It was simply an undoing of what had been done in the Legislature of each kingdom to harass and injure the other—a repeal of the old laws prohibiting kindly intercourse between the inhabitants of the two countries, and in each of them fostering and encouraging such mischief as its inhabitants did on the other side of the Border. So the Parliament of England which rose in July 1607, left on record "an Act for the utter

¹ Bruce's Report, Appendix No. xviii. Harington, writing to Secretary Barlow, says: "I heard the uniting the kingdoms is now at hand. When the Parliament is held more will be done in this matter. Bacon is to manage all the affair, as who can better do these State jobs?"—*Nugæ Antiquæ*, i. 353.

abolition of all memory of hostility and the dependence thereof between England and Scotland, and for the repressing of occasions of disorders, and disorders, for time to come.”¹ In the ensuing August, Scotland reciprocated, in an Act alike in substance, though it was merely called “An Act anent the Union of Scotland and England.” It repealed a significant list of Acts for the accomplishment of such purposes as these :—

“All persons remaining in England without the king’s licence commits treason.

“Assurance with Englishmen, or taking from them protection for land or goods, is treason.

“That na Englishman come to Scotland without conduct, and that na Scotsman sit under assurance of them.”

The latest on the list was but six years old,—its object was, as if for the abatement of a nuisance, to restrain the marriage of Scots subjects “upon the daughters of the broken men and thieves of England.” Scots committing injury in England were now no longer to be held as doing acceptable service, but might be punished. The law could not be as it now is, that when a crime was committed in any place, the officers of justice could pursue the perpetrator through any part of the United Kingdom, and bring him back to the spot for trial. But if a Scot committed an offence in England, the sufferer could prosecute the offender before the Scots tribunals. He might come to them, and bring his witnesses; and that there might be no molestation from invidious counter-charges, he and his witnesses were not to be, during the course of the suit, amenable in Scotland for any acts previously done by them, unless these amounted to murder or treason. There were some relaxations of trade rules, in which Scotland abandoned any invidious advantages in the wine trade with France. As an exception to the laws for the prohibition of foreign imports, goods, the actual produce or manufacture of either country, might be carried into the other. Facilities for the use of the shipping of both countries were given for whatever commerce was

¹ 4 James I. c. i.

lawful between them; and of these facilities it may be said, that they removed for the time such invidious restraints as had in the earlier law anticipated the restrictive English navigation Acts of later times. This is, as we shall afterwards see when we come to the working of these later Acts, an important element in the political history of the two nations. This Act abolished that complicated code, so precarious in its practical working, known as the Border laws. They were an attempt, so far, to modify the hostile laws of the two countries, as to render it practicable that life and property could exist on either side in the neighbourhood of the marches; and after the repeal of these hostile laws the Border laws were no longer necessary.

But a judgment on a point of the common law of England did more than all the labours of the king, the Court, and the two Parliaments, to make the English and the Scots one people. This was the celebrated case of "*the postnati*," in which it was decided that all persons born in Scotland after the union of the crowns in 1603 were entitled in England to all the privileges of Englishmen. So momentous was the question, that had the judgment been other than it was, the most substantial power influencing the Union of a century later had been wanting; and without some equivalent force arising in some unknown place and shape, England and Scotland would not have become one empire.

The suit ramified itself into various shapes, both at common law and in Chancery. The final judgment was delivered by Lord Chancellor Ellesmere in the Court of the Exchequer Chamber. It had the support of ten out of the twelve judges.¹ Though the interests at stake were so vast, and the earnestness and solemnity of the deliberations were adapted to the occasion, yet, like many a great public

¹ The duality of the minority is quaintly but very distinctly told by Lord Ellesmere: "I heard many learned and judicious arguments made by the reverend judges; and finding that they did not all concur in opinion, though the number was indeed so few of them that differed, that in Greek it would not make a plural number," &c.—*State Trials*, ii. 659.

cause, it arose in a question about a petty right of freehold which found its way into the King's Bench, and a question about the recovery of title-deeds, which was a Chancery matter.

The suit was raised in the name of Robert Calvin or Colville, a child three years old. It opened with a writ to the Sheriff of Middlesex, showing how "Robert Calvin, gent., hath complained to us that Richard Smith and Nicholas Smith unjustly, and without judgment, have dis-seized him of his freehold in Haggard, otherwise Hagger-ton, otherwise Aggerston, in the parish of St Leonards, in Shoreditch." On the other part, "the said Richard and Nicholas, by William Edwards their attorney, come and say that the said Robert is an Alien, born on the 5th day of November, in the third year of the reign of the king that now is of England, France, and Ireland, and of Scotland the thirtieth, at Edinburgh, within his kingdom of Scotland aforesaid, and within the allegiance of the king of the said kingdom of Scotland, and out of the allegiance of the said lord the king of his kingdom of England." Through a succession of such technicalities the case marched forward. But in their technical use of precedents the common-lawyers could not in such a case avoid large questions. These precedents applied to Wales, Ireland, the Isle of Man, England itself before the Conquest, Berwick-upon-Tweed since it had been taken from Scotland, the Scots Border districts while they were in the possession of England, the original foreign territories of the Norman conquerors—still represented by the Channel Islands—the French territories of the Plantagenets, and Calais and other parts of France, which had come to England not by undisputed inheritance but by conquest.

This was the first great public discussion of Scots affairs in England in which the feudal dependency of Scotland on the English crown neither openly came up nor secretly influenced the conduct of those concerned. It was not pleaded, and therefore to the judges it did not exist. It may be noted that it would have fallen to the side of the Scots to plead it, as showing that they existed in the al-

legiance of the King of England, a plea which Edward I. would readily have accepted ; whether it would have been pleaded, had it served the other side, is among the uncertainties about which every one may make his own guess.

It was, in fact, the position of Scotland as an independent sovereignty that created all the difficulty, by neutralising precedents applicable to places held to be more or less in dependence on the crown of England. Hence against the claim for the Scots it was pleaded, "that the great seal of England, which is the organ by which the law is conveyed, is not powerful nor binding in Scotland ;—therefore those born in Scotland not inheritable to the laws of England, nor to be born subjects of England, when they cannot be commanded by the great seal of England. *Reason*, That in subordinate kingdoms, dukedoms, or seignories—as Ireland, Gascoign, Aquitain, Anjois—the great seal of England is passable, and the Parliament of England hath power ; as is proved by that a writ of error may be brought in the King's Bench of a judgment in Ireland, and the Parliament of England may make a statute to bind in Ireland if Ireland be specially named." "The case is not like between England and these kingdoms and dukedoms subordinate to England as it is between England and Scotland—Scotland being a distinct kingdom not subordinate, and as ancient as England itself."¹

Bacon spoke as counsel on the Scots side with his usual lofty composure and fertility of learned illustration. But it was one of the occasions in which he lent these powers to the furtherance of those encroachments of the prerogative which were to have results so disastrous. King James, as we have seen, had issued a proclamation making the two kingdoms one. Following up this act of prerogative, his new solicitor said : "In all the distributions of persons, and the degrees of abilities or capacities, the king's act is all in all without any manner of respect to law or Parliament. For it is the king that makes an alien enemy by proclaiming war, wherewith the law or Parlia-

¹ State Trials, ii. 567, 568.

ment intermeddles not. So the king only grants safe-conducts, wherewith the law and Parliament intermeddle not. It is the king that makes a denizen by his charter absolutely of his prerogative and power, wherewith law and Parliament intermeddle not. And therefore it is strongly to be inferred, that as all these degrees depend wholly upon the king's act, and no way on law and Parliament, so the fourth, although it comes not by the king's patent but by operation of law, yet that the law in that operation respecteth only the king's person, without respect to subjection to law or Parliament."¹

The question was not decided on the ground that it lay within the king's prerogative; nor did it rest on any principle of enlightened international policy. It rested on what may be called a technicality in pleading. Of that technicality Bacon himself gives the substance, with his own peculiar conciseness and clearness, thus: "For forms of pleading, it is true that hath been said, that if a man would plead another to be an alien, he must not only set forth negatively and primatively that he was born out of the obedience of our sovereign lord the king, but affirmatively, under the obedience of a foreign king or State in particular—which never could be done in this case."²

Those sages of the common law who by degrees and in the course of ages had adjusted this technicality in pleading, had probably little anticipation of the wide purpose for which it might be used. But it was in itself a technicality involving a sound principle of justice and safety. That a man was an alien not entitled to the privileges of an Englishman, was a vague saying, and vagueness leaves room for oppression and injustice. That he actually owed allegiance elsewhere, pointed to a fact which, if it were proved, was conclusive.

Besides the beneficent character of the decision itself, the method by which it was reached was well fitted to have a wholesome influence on the sensitive and suspicious

¹ State Trials, ii. 583.

² Bruce's Report, Appendix No. cxvii.

Scots. It was a remarkable instance of that precision in separating the law from the facts and general conditions of the litigation itself, which had become so decisive a feature in the English administration of justice, and was so woefully wanting in the Scots, that it is scarcely yet achieved. It was the principle that the law must stand as it is found, whatever may be the result, and whoever may be affected by that result. The English laws might be good or they might be bad, but the new partners of England had an assurance that they would be justly administered in questions between them and their powerful associates.¹

The reciprocity of the principle of this case on the side of Scotland was a question rather of courtesy than of importance to the inhabitants of England. It was in 1608 that the case was decided in England. Either, however, with the purpose of furthering such a decision, or under some policy not immediately apparent, it happens that in the Act for the repeal of the laws hostile to England passed by the Estates in 1607, there is a clause extending the right of Scots citizenship to the *postnati* of England.

When we look to the Acts for the repeal of the old hostile laws on either side, to the decision in favour of the *postnati*, and to a lord high commissioner representing the king in the Estates and the Secret Council,—we shall see all the visible changes that came immediately to Scotland through the succession of the Stewarts to the throne of England. The event strengthened the Crown in Scotland; but the increase of strength came stealthily and imperceptibly, like a natural growth, and made little disturbance. It was in the Church that the King of Scotland's newly-acquired power was to exert itself to greatest purpose, and hence it is that for some time we shall find ecclesiastical discussions absorbing the whole public and historic life of Scotland.

Before entering on this contest it may be proper to note

¹ There is a very full report of the case of the *postnati* in the State Trials, ii. 459 *et seq.*

an incident which was propitious to the king's reputation and influence, by silencing those who denied the existence of the Gowrie Conspiracy, and sought to put in its place a succession of machinations by the king and his creatures for the ruin of that family. We have seen that just five persons were concerned in the plot—the Earl of Gowrie, his brother, Logan of Restalrig, a dependant of his called Laird Bower, and a person still unknown, who must have been a man of note, since he was addressed as “right honourable sir.” But the world knew nothing about the participation of three among these five until some years after the king had left Scotland; and the affair was shrouded in the suspicious mystery that not the faintest trace of it could be carried beyond the two brothers, who had both been slain.

A certain George Sprot or Sprote transacted business as a notary in Eyemouth, a seaport town on the Berwickshire coast which had risen to importance before the Union as the chief port of the south-eastern part of Scotland. He had managed professional affairs for Robert Logan of Restalrig, who had died in 1606. Of this Sprot it came to be rumoured, that in unguarded moments he muttered some things importing that he possessed the key that could unlock the great mystery, and could put his hand upon it at any time among his professional papers. It is a common propensity for people of heated imaginations to offer confessions or revelations about some great crime on which the public mind is brooding. In this instance, Sir Thomas Hamilton, the Lord Advocate, a sagacious man, who possibly may have had separate reasons for thinking there might be a foundation for Sprot's hints, thought the affair sufficiently serious for inquiry. Sprot at first denied all knowledge of the affair; but having been “booted,” or subjected to the torture of the boots, he confessed that he knew about the hatching of the plot, and revealed the documents, which have been already cited as affording so clear an account of the arrangements of the conspirators. It seems that he had been at Fast Castle on private business. There, that faithful subordinate Laird Bower got Sprot to read some of the documents to him, being, as it

appears, himself unable to read. Sprot took advantage of an opportunity to purloin part of the correspondence, and thus to be the possessor of matter very perilous to his own safety. Both Logan and Bower had died two years before these revelations, and, as Archbishop Abbot said, "departed unto far greater torment than all the earth could lay upon them." The only living victim, therefore, who could now be sacrificed, was Sprot himself. It is said in a contemporary narrative, that he "cleared many things to the Council, and caused sundry men of rank to be suspected."¹ There is no trace of such revelations in the official documents as they are preserved; and, oddly enough, they bear no mark of any attempt to trace the "right honourable" gentleman who is the unknown among the five conspirators.

Sprot was condemned to death in the savage form usual in convictions for treason. His execution was witnessed by George Abbot, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who preserved an account of it. The opportunity was a good one for finding favour with the king in an honest and legitimate form, by showing how, "after so many years, and that from the bones of a dead man, when living men would not believe it, God hath given farther light to the opening of the conspiracy of that ungodly Earl of Gowrie, which some persons, affected more to a rebel that is dead than to their living sovereign, did endeavour to disguise and mask at their own pleasure." According to other accounts, as well as Abbot's, the victim was profusely penitent and pious. He fell on his knees, and "in a prayer to God, uttered aloud, he so passionately deplored his former wickedness, but especially that sin of his for which he was to die, that a man may justly say he did in a sort deject and cast down himself to the gates of hell, as if he should there have been swallowed up in the gulf of desperation; yet presently laying hold upon the mercies of God in Christ, he raised himself, and strangely lifted up his soul unto the throne of grace, applying joy and comfort to his own heart so effectually as cannot well be described.

¹ Pitcairn, ii. 275.

In the admitting of this consolation into his inward man, he burst out into tears, so plentifully flowing from him that for a time they stopped his voice; the sight and hearing whereof wrought so forcible an impression in those persons of honour and learned men who beheld him, that there was scant any one of them who could refrain tears in the place, as divers of themselves that day did witness to me."

His manner of "laying hold upon the mercies of God in Christ" was one of those curious instances in which an excess of religious fervency appears to drive out of the zealot's mind all sense of awe and veneration, and to set him to argue or bargain with the Almighty as man to man: "At last he proceeded, 'Yet, most merciful Father,' whereat he made a stay, and repeating the word 'Father' with a marvellous loud and shrill voice, he added: 'Why should I call Thee Father, that have so many ways and so horribly transgressed the commandments in all the course of my life, but especially in concealing this vile, fearful, and devilish treason against my most gracious sovereign? Lord, Lord, there is nothing belongeth to me but wrath and confusion.' And so went on in a strange unaffected current of words, lively expressing the sorrow of his heart. Yet there he stayed not, but spake forward to this purpose: 'Notwithstanding, Lord, Thou hast left me this comfort in Thy Word, that Thou hast said, Come unto me, all ye who are weary and laden, and I will refresh you. Lord, I am weary; Lord, I am heavily laden with my sins, which are innumerable. I am ready to sink, Lord, even to hell, without Thou in Thy mercy put to Thy hand and deliver me. Lord, Thou hast promised by Thine own word out of "Thine own mouth, that Thou wilt refresh the weary soul."' And with that he thrust out one of his hands, and reaching as high as he could, with a louder voice and a strained, cried, 'I challenge Thee, Lord, by that word, and by that promise which Thou hast made, that Thou perform and make it good to me that call for ease and mercy at Thy hands.'"

In the depths of his penitence he said "that God had kept him since that attempt of the Earl of Gowrie's from

very many dangers ; but notably from one, when, being in apparent hazard from drowning, he was strangely delivered, 'which,' said he, 'was God's work, that I might remain alive until this happy and blessed day, that the truth might be made known. And now I confess my fault, to the shame of myself and the shame of the devil, but to the glory of God ; and I do it neither for fear of death or for any hope of life—for I have deserved to die, and am unworthy to live—but because it is the truth which I shall seal with my blood. My fault,' saith he, 'is so great, that if I had a thousand lives, and could die ten thousand deaths, yet I might not make satisfaction that I should conceal such a treason against so gracious a king.'" It was a pleasant piece of good fortune to Abbot to have to carry home these acceptable sayings to his master. Yet he was not so successful a competitor among the servile crew as to be exempt from royal frowns, which humiliated him in his old age.

His account of the whole scene ends rather picturesquely, thus : "These things were done in the open sight of the sun, in the king's capital town, at the market-cross in Edinburgh, in the presence of divers thousands of all Scots—of the nobility, of the clergy, of the gentry, of the burgesses, of women and children—myself, with the rest of the English ministers, standing by and looking on, and giving God the glory that after so long a space as eight years and eight days—for so it was by just computation after the attempt of Gowrie—He was pleased to give so noble a testimony unto that which by some maligners had been secretly called in question without any ground or reason."¹

We have seen the story revealed by the documents thus discovered. As the newly-exposed traitor had been two years in his grave, the ceremony, deemed so revolting and

¹ "The Examination, Arraignment, and Conviction of George Sprot, Notary at Eyemouth, &c. Before which treatise is prefixed also a preface, written by G. Abbot, Doctor of Divinity, and Dean of Winchester, who was present at the said Sprot's execution." Reprinted, Pitcairn, ii. 262.

barbarous, was repeated ; and his bones were taken from the earth and laid down before the High Court of Parliament, while they adjudged the man whose parts they were in the life to have been a traitor. The arraignment of Lethington after death was here aggravated, for his body had not been buried. But barbarous as this practice was, it came of an excess of the old Saxon spirit, that no judicial work was to be done in darkness or uncertainty. Though the actual traitor had gone to his account, there were persons whose interests were still at stake in the judicial proceedings—the descendants who would be involved in the forfeiture of the estates. It was contrary to the old spirit of the law, that on some vague statement of a man having committed crimes, and being no longer alive to answer for them, the rights of survivors should be imperilled. In proof that the man was dead, there was his body as newly slain, or his bones as they were found in the family burying-place.¹

There was now another forfeiture, and of a goodly territory. It was an instance where the law of forfeiture took one of its hardest aspects, stripping an unconscious young man, who was acquitted of all concern in his father's crime, of the estates in his peaceful possession. There is much to be said for the forfeiture of family estates for political crimes in times when territorial power was everything, and descendants inherited the quarrels of their ancestors. The efforts frequently made to secure the estate elsewhere, while he in whose hands it would otherwise be found is free to take some desperate course, are of themselves sufficient testimony that the power of forfeiture

¹ There have been efforts to trace this practice in other countries, but without much distinct result. It is said by one of the oldest authorities on Scots criminal law, Sir George Mackenzie : "Albeit the bones of the defunct traitor are ordinarily taken up and brought to the pannel, in pursuits of this nature, as was done in the forefaulter of the Laird of Restalrig, yet this is not necessary." On this Lord Hailes, who is rarely facetious, remarks : "He is certainly in the right, for the bones of a traitor can neither plead defences nor cross-question witnesses ; and upon this matter there is no difference whether the accused person be absent in body or present in bones." —Pitcairn, ii. 277.

gives a hold on men's conduct which the governments of the day could not be expected to abandon. No doubt the right of forfeiture was often invidiously and cruelly used in Scotland; but the forfeitures in Scotland depended on the actions of the men who incurred them, and were not that absolute death of the right of inheritance which was the essence of the English "corruption of blood"—that rule which, in the words of its propounders, "dams up and renders utterly impervious" any right of succession through a condemned traitor. In Scotland the forfeiture affected the property of the criminal, and consequently the succession to it of his children and other representatives; but it did not, as the English system virtually did, forfeit property which he never had possessed. How this might come by the "corruption of blood" may be shown in the following simple instance. Take three brothers: the eldest succeeds to the family estate, but is childless; the second, who is also childless, is attainted for treason; the third has a son, who in the ordinary course of events would be heir to the family estate. But, in the theory of the law, because his father represented his immediate elder brother, and that brother is not representable, the corruption of his blood stops the genealogical course of descent; and no estate from any ancestor, if that second brother would have succeeded to it had it come to the family in his lifetime, could ever pass to any descendant of his younger brother.

CHAPTER LXIV.

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

MILLENNARY PETITION—HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE—KING JAMES'S RETALIATION ON HIS PRESBYTERIAN TORMENTORS—ADULATION OF THE ENGLISH CLERGY—HOW THE KING TOOK IT—STEPS TO AN AUTHORISED VERSION OF THE BIBLE—EFFECT OF THE CONFERENCE IN SCOTLAND—THE “POPES OF EDINBURGH”—CONTEST OF THE CLERGY AND THE CROWN—ASSEMBLY AT ABERDEEN—THE SOUTH AND THE NORTH—THE KING'S LETTER—TRIAL OF WELSH AND HIS BRETHREN—ANDREW MELVILLE AND HIS FOLLOWERS DRAWN TO LONDON—THEIR TREATMENT THERE—DEATH AND CHARACTER OF MELVILLE—REMODELLING OF THE CHURCH—RESTORATION OF EPISCOPACY—THE REVENUES OF THE OLD CHURCH—HOW THE ATTEMPTS TO OBTAIN THEM FOR THE NEW BISHOPS WERE DEFEATED—INCIDENTS OF THE CONTEST, AND THE PERSONAL AND PECUNIARY INTERESTS CONCERNED IN IT—THE BISHOPS IN THE HIGHLANDS AND THE ISLES.

It is now proposed to part with secular politics for a time, and follow the course of some ecclesiastical quarrels which were destined to lead on to memorable issues. The strife started in the celebrated Hampton Court conference. This belongs immediately to English history. Its concern with Scotland was indirect; yet it was momentous, as those events in which a community see in the fate of a neighbour what is in preparation for themselves. The direct issues were of small moment even in England. Among the historical events of the time, the conference stands like a dwindling mimicry of the great colloquy of Poisy held fifty years earlier. In the English meeting there was no such deep gulf between the two opponents. The ruling party did not look across at fierce

and powerful leaders able to bring out a force which might match their own, but received a deputation of a few of their own brethren meekly suing for some relief to tender consciences. As a further difference, no leader was absent from Hampton Court because he dreaded assassination.

The opposition were called the Millenary party, because there had been presented to the king on his way to Court a petition said to be signed by a thousand clergy, and they were present to support its prayer. It is questioned whether it had quite a thousand signatures; but it is of consequence to remember that those who signed were not separatists or dissenters, but clergymen of the Church of England who felt themselves "groaning as under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies."¹ Coming after the great Reformation conflicts, and even in comparison with the wide quarrel between the Huguenot party in Scotland and their Prelatic rivals, the demands are small, reaching nothing like a Presbyterian polity, or spiritual independence and "the headship of Christ."

Some of the grievances were of a technical character connected with the practice of ecclesiastical courts, and others, relating to the bestowal of benefices, had reference rather to matters of secular justice and expediency than to vital questions of ecclesiastical policy. Of those which

¹ Fuller, in his quaint way, says: "This was called the millenary petition, as one of a thousand, though indeed there were but seven hundred and fifty preachers' hands set thereunto; but those all collected only out of five-and-twenty counties. However, for the more rotundity of the number and grace of the matter, it passeth for a full thousand, which no doubt the collectors of the names, if so minded, might easily have completed. I dare not guess what made them desist before their number was completed—whether they thought that these were enough to do the deed, and more were rather for ostentation than use, or because, disheartened by the intervening of the Hampton Court conference, they thought that they were even too many to petition for a denial. It is left as yet uncertain whether this conference was by the king's favour graciously tendered, or by the mediation of the lords of his Council powerfully procured, or by the bishops as confident of their cause voluntarily professed, or by the ministers' importunity effectually obtained."—Church History, ii. 7.

are recognisable as points of difference among Christian denominations, the most important were : " That the cross in baptism, interrogatories ministered to infants, confirmations—as superfluous, may be taken away." " The cap and surplice not urged. That examination may go before the communion. That it be ministered with a sermon. That divers terms of ' priests ' and ' absolution,' and some other used, with the ring in marriage and other suchlike in the book, may be corrected. The longsomeness of service abridged. Church songs and music moderated to better edification. That the Lord's Day be not profaned; the rest upon holidays not so strictly urged." ¹

Looking at the limited nature of these demands, it is difficult to join in the censure directed on the narrowness of the concessions made, or the character of the Assembly which disposed of the matter. There was no call for a great council in which two parties were to fight a battle, pitting their best champions against each other. It was a petition for certain modifications; and the petition came before the prelates as heads of the Church, while a deputation from the petitioners attended to support it. Whoever else might be either pleased or displeased, the whole affair inspired the king with lively delight. It gave him an opportunity of displaying two of his cherished accomplishments—classic scholarship and polemics. He would have a little buffoonery too; and as it was a king who took that liberty with them, the grave and reverend seigniors felt it their duty to endure it. But sweetest of all the enjoyments of the occasion was the sense of safety from his old ecclesiastical harassers, accompanied by an opportunity of retaliation. Throughout his squabbles with the High-Church Presbyterians, he had made occasional efforts in his own clumsy way to propitiate them. One of these which has often been referred to stands thus in Calderwood's History, which is the one testimony to it. The occasion of its delivery was a General Assembly held in October 1590, when the high party were at the summit of their power, and the king, after his marriage and his

¹ Fuller, x. 22.

adventurous journey, was in a condition of high geniality :—

“In end, to please the assembly, he fell forth in praising God that he was born in such a time as the time of the light of the Gospel, to such a place as to be king in such a Kirk—the sincerest Kirk in the world. ‘The Kirk of Geneva,’ said he, ‘keepeth Pasche and Youle ; what have they for them?—they have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk in England, it is an evil-said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you, my good people—ministers, doctors, nobles, gentlemen, and barons—to stand to your purity, and exhort the people to do the same ; and I, forsooth, so long as I bruik my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly,’ ” &c.¹

They to whom such morsels of flattery were flung, were apt to receive them as the watchdog, following his honest instincts, receives the blandishments of the intruder under suspicion. The king, however, no longer required to propitiate his tormentors. He was beyond their reach ; and he had no sooner seated himself in safety than he discharged an arrow at them. The very suddenness of the retaliation assigned it to premeditation rather than impetuosity, since it showed a deliberate design to seize the earliest opportunity for avenging old insults. We are told how the condition in which he found the Church of his new dominion “so affected his royal heart, that it pleased him both to enter into a congratulation to Almighty God (at which words he put off his hat) for bringing him into the promised land, where religion was purely professed, where he sat among grave, learned, and reverend men ; not as

¹ Calderwood’s History, v. 105, 106. Like many other transactions in the civil as well as the ecclesiastical history of that period in Scotland, this speech, thoroughly characteristic as it is, seems to rest on the sole authority of the collections made by the industrious Calderwood. It is not preserved by Spottiswood, who gives an account of the Assembly (p. 382). It was not one of the passages which the archbishop would think especially worthy of commemoration. It happens, however, that James Melville, who was present, says nothing about the king’s speech, while he gives at much length his own address as the retiring moderator (Diary, 280).

before elsewhere, a king without state, without honour, without order, where beardless boys would brave him to his face." When the millenaries, or plaintiffs, as they are called, had come to the question of the absolute injunction of the cross in baptism, desiring that it might be left to conscience, the king broke in with some petulancies, among which he said, "that it smelled very rankly of Anabaptism, comparing it to the usage of a beardless boy—one Mr John Black—who, the last controversy his majesty had with the ministers of Scotland, December 1602, told him that he would hold conformity with his majesty's ordinances for matter of doctrine; but for matter of ceremony, they were to be left in Christian liberty to every man, as he received more and more light from the illumination of God's Spirit—'even till they go mad,' quoth the king, 'with their own light. But I will none of that; I will have one doctrine and one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony.'" ¹

But the king had an opportunity for a still more brilliant denunciation of his old tormentors. Though it has been often repeated, it is necessary to make room for it here; and to make its full purpose intelligible, it must be preceded by the provocation, which arose in some words

¹ Here we must take Dr Barlow, not as a minute reporter of what was said, but as expressing the points in the king's speech which struck himself and his brother clergy as having an important reference to the relations between the new sovereign and their Church. The beardless boy, John Black, is not to be found among the Scots ecclesiastical celebrities of the day; and there appears to have been no other conference of the king with the Scots clergy in 1602, except that with Bruce about the Gowrie Conspiracy. We have seen how a David Black gained renown by his "Declinatour," but this was in 1596. He died in 1603, when he was probably in middle age, as we find James Melville calling him, in 1591, "a man mighty in doctrine, and of singular fidelity and diligence in the ministry" (Diary, 293). We thus unfortunately lose trace of the identity of the "beardless"—singular or plural—who had so disturbed the king's equanimity that he was driven to refer to the affair more than once, on occasions that, if they were not solemn, should have been so. It need scarcely be noted, perhaps, that no Scots clergyman he may have had a dispute with would have engaged to "hold conformity with his majesty's ordinances for matter of doctrine."

unconsciously used by the pious, learned, and peaceable Reynolds. He suggested "that, according to certain provincial constitutions, they of the clergy might have meetings once every three weeks: first, in rural deaneries, and therein to have prophesying [viz., preaching], according as the reverend father, Archbishop Grindal, and other bishops desired of her late majesty; secondly, that such things as could not be resolved upon there, might be referred to archdeacons' visitation; and so, thirdly, from them to the Episcopal synod, where the bishop with his presbytery should determine all such points as before could not be determined."

Here the words synod and presbytery, assailing the royal ear, opened up the fountain of all his griefs, and enough is said about the keeping of his temper to show that he lost it:

"His majesty was somewhat stirred—yet, which is admirable in him, without passion or show thereof—thinking that they aimed at a Scottish presbytery, 'which,' saith he, 'as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasure censure me and my Council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say it must be thus; and therefore here I must once reiterate my former speech, *Le roy s'avisera*. Stay, I pray you, for one seven year before you demand that of me; and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you. For let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath.'"

These specimens may suffice to show how far removed this lively assemblage was from the solemn gravity which makes the minutes of ecclesiastical councils very arid reading to those who take no more than a historical interest in them.

Yet once again he came back upon his tormentors in Scotland. The question was, how long some of the clergy might have to declare whether they would conform to the surplice and the cross in baptism; and he accused them of preferring "the credits of a few private men before the general peace of the Church;" saying further: "This is

just the Scottish argument ; for when anything was there concluded which disliked some humours, the only reason why they would not obey was, it stood not with their credits to yield, having so long time been of the contrary opinion."

There was one point on which the king was suspicious about the views of the millenarians. He did not feel a comfortable assurance that they thoroughly acknowledged his ecclesiastical supremacy. Reynolds, to whom he specially appealed, admitted it in a brief dry way. The king told them an anecdote—not quite accurate—to the effect that Knox and his followers were ready to acknowledge the supremacy of his grandmother, Mary of Guise, until they felt themselves strong enough to do without it. Then applying the precedent, he said : "My lords the bishops, I may thank you that these men do thus plead for my supremacy. They think they cannot make their party good against you but by appealing unto it, as if you, or some that adhere unto you, were not well affected towards it. But if once you were out, and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy. No bishop, no king, as before I said." The end of this tirade was, "I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of this land, or yet do worse." This conclusion was infinitely gratifying, and, as the recorder of the conference says, "raised such an admiration in the lords in respect of the king's singular readiness and exact knowledge, that one of them said he was fully persuaded his majesty spake by the instinct of the Spirit of God." We are not told whether it was a spiritual or a temporal lord who thus spoke. There follows a chorus of applause to the same tenor. It comes rather grotesquely, in a discussion of the procedure of ecclesiastical courts, after some hardly-quotable remarks about the practice in Scotland of requiring those whose names were subject to scandal—female as well as male—to appear in the "cutty-stool" or place of shame.

The king's remarks on these matters were sagacious, and would have done credit to a bailie of a burgh or a ruling elder. But the effect on his audience was that

“the Archbishop of Canterbury said that undoubtedly his majesty spake by the special assistance of God’s Spirit. The Bishop of London upon his knee protested that his heart melted within him—so, as he doubted not, did the hearts of the whole congregation—with joy, and made haste to acknowledge unto Almighty God the singular mercy we have received of His hands in giving us such a king, as since Christ’s time the like he thought had not been; whereunto the lords with one voice did yield a very affectionate acclamation.” In all this there was a fascinating contrast to those Assemblies where Andrew Melville would shake him by the sleeve, and hurl a contemptuous epithet against him. The narrator of these scenes was William Barlow, Dean of Chester, who immediately afterwards became Bishop of Rochester. This is material to their significance, since they are recorded by one who might be counted on not to repeat anything that he thought indecorous or unworthy. We may believe, then, that the grotesque features of the scene were rather subdued than exaggerated.¹ That dignitaries of the Church should combine in performing such scenes, and revealing them to the world, has naturally been heavily censured by the High Presbyterian Church party, whose drolleries, when they indulged in any, were of a totally different kind. But the exhibition was only too natural. A belief in the divine right of kings was becoming a prevalent doctrine among English Churchmen; and they were not inclined too fastidiously to criticise the announcement of their own favourite doctrine by one who was so evidently inclined to use it for their own exaltation and the depression of their enemies.²

¹ See “The Sum and Substance of the Conference which it pleased his Excellent Majesty to have with the Lords Bishops and others of his Clergy—at which most of the Lords of the Council were present—in his Majesty’s Privy Chamber at Hampton Court, Jan. 14, 1603. Contracted by William Barlow, Doctor of divinity and Dean of Chester.” This is reprinted in the ‘Phoenix’ and the ‘Concilia.’

² It was possible for divine-right theories to take too high a flight for King James’s taste—that is to say, a flight beyond their one legitimate object, which was to keep him firmly seated on his united

It is amusing, as a feature of the times, to find that one of the burdens from which tender consciences sought relief was the insufficiency of the law to suppress the circulation of books offensive to their taste and opinions. The gentle Reynolds pleaded that "unlawful and seditious books might be suppressed—at least restrained, and imparted to a few; for by the liberty of publishing such books so commonly, many young scholars and unsettled minds in both universities, and through the whole realm, were corrupted and perverted."

It would be wrong to leave the conference of Hampton Court at this point, and without allusion to one noble vestige which its counsels left on the annals of the age. It was here that the project for printing the English Bible in the still "authorised version" came into palpable existence. It was a matter in which Scotland was not technically concerned, since its official adoption and authorisation applied only to England—and, as we shall see, the Scots Presbyterians repudiated a standard translation. But it was in Scotland that the authorised version received in the end the warmest welcome. It became the absolute standard in some respects of literature as well as of religion. Many would read no other book; and throughout the Protestant community all who professed a decorous walk in life counted it the court of absolute and last appeal

throne. It was convenient that he should be in alliance with the newly-established Dutch Republic; but at a meeting called Overall's Convention, there were some whispers against the encouragement of revolvers, with suggestions that the King of Spain, if not king there *de facto*, was king *de jure*. King James saw in such a doctrine the possibility of some *de jure* spectre coming forth from the darkness and pushing him from his *de facto* stool, and sitting there—perhaps the King of Spain himself, founding on the Lancaster connection, old treaties, or Papal rights. He wrote an angry letter to George Abbot on the point, saying, "I am the next heir, and the crown is mine by all rights you can name but that of conquest;" and, "If the King of Spain shall return to claim his old pontifical right to my kingdom, you leave me to seek for others to fight for it: for you tell us upon the matter beforehand his authority is God's authority if he prevail." This letter is in Welwood's *Memoirs*, p. 38. The editors of the 'Concilia' have acknowledged its authenticity by receiving it into their collection.

from all other literature. There was some critical caviling about mistranslations found in existing versions, as to which the Bishop of London made the remark, that "if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no end of translation." To this the king threw in a conclusion, expressed with a brevity and felicity far from his wont: "His majesty wished that some special pains should be taken in that behalf for one uniform translation, professing that he could never yet see a Bible well translated into English."

It has been said of King James, that if he stumbled on some really noble project, his perverse taste would overcome him in the way of performing it. When he came to particular defects in existing translations, he denounced that of Geneva, because the rubrics or marginal titles seemed to point at doctrines not quite in accordance with his own divine right as king.¹

There was present at the conference, as a listener and spectator, a Scots minister named Patrick Galloway. His presence was, it seems, desired by the king. As no other motive can be found for bringing him up, we are left to suppose that he was to tell his brethren all that he saw and heard, as a wholesome warning to them. The affair, indeed, must have proved to the High-Church Presbyterians that they were entering on a contest which would tax all their strength—and of that they had indeed very little. The authority of "the popes of Edinburgh," 2

¹ "Some notes, very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits—as, for example, Exodus, i. 19, where the marginal note alloweth disobedience to kings; and Chronicles, xx. 16, the note taxeth Asa for deposing his mother only, and not killing her." Principal Lee questions the accuracy of this part of Barlow's narrative, chiefly because "it is not very probable that the king would speak so disrespectfully of a translation which he had authorised to be printed for the instruction of his subjects; and it is incredible that, after this opinion was pronounced, he should have never, during the remaining twenty-two years of his reign, authorised the printing of any other version in Scotland."—*Memorials for the Bible Societies*, 75. But King James was not one of that limited body of men as to whom a story may be discredited on the simple ground that it implies inconsistency of opinion or conduct.

though perhaps it was a little enlarged since Melville began his career, was scarcely felt beyond the Firth of Tay on the north, and the districts bounded by Lanarkshire and Berwickshire. When "the popes" could be induced to try their strength in Aberdeen, or even in Perth, they were sure to be beaten. As to the General Assembly itself, it was a novelty recently brought from France. To contend with the Crown—with old fixed tribunals, such as the Courts of Secret Council and Justiciary—with the all-powerful Estates, which in the end pronounced against such an institution,—required an overwhelming popularity, and they had very little. Instead of concealing this weakness, they made it as widely notorious as they could, by repeated threats and denunciations against the people for the awful crime of disaffection to their legitimate spiritual masters. A day was fixed for solemnly dealing with this evil, and it ended in the production of a document, the very title of which proves how little popularity the party could count on at this period,—its representatives in the next generation became both powerful and popular, and this change came from causes which are easily traceable. This title was, "Causes of the Defection from the Purity, Zeal, and Practice of true Religion in all Estates of the Country, and how the same may be most effectually remedied."

They combined these lamentable symptoms with certain conclusions as to God's wrath, in a manner to furnish a good specimen of that circular logic which inevitably befalls those who profess to account not only for the acts, but even for the motives, of the Almighty power:—

"The principal cause of this fearful change, no doubt, is the just wrath of God kindled against the whole land for the unreverend estimation of the Gospel; and for the sins of all estates and dishonouring of their profession, and making the name of God to be blasphemed by the profane world without remorse."

There were other secondary grievances, such as deficiency in the proper endowments of Gospel ministers, and the insufficiency of the sound religious teaching of youth. We have an account by the chosen few of their reverend

brethren, which must, if true, have been sufficient to damp any zeal not supported by a sense of infallibility :—

“Negligence in the lives of the ministry; not framing their conversations in gravity, as patterns of life to the people, but framing themselves excessively to the humours of men, especially communication at tables, and giving sometimes example of intemperance; in the light and prodigal habiliments of their families.”

The accounts of Assemblies and other ecclesiastical meetings, though abundant, become now profitless. The departure of the king, as it took from their vivacity, seems also to have reduced their influence. The civil power determined to make war with the high party, and gained an easy victory. It was fought on the question whether General Assemblies belonged to the Crown, and were called and adjourned in the king's name, or were bodies acting in self-centred independence. This question, oddly enough, is not yet settled, and it is evaded by a subterfuge so abundantly ridiculous as to be a standing butt for the jests of the profane. Andrew Melville and his friends, however, were not the men to leave such a question open.

It was determined among his party to invade the enemy, and hold a General Assembly at Aberdeen. It was prohibited by royal proclamation. The great body of the clergy stayed at home; but Melville and his immediate friends journeyed to Aberdeen, and met there, nine in number. This small body went through a good deal of work in protesting and remonstrating; and in a second meeting, also denounced by royal authority, they mustered nineteen. The civil power now determined to act, and there was a general seizure among the recusants, of whom fourteen were committed to various prisons.

We are fortunate in the preservation of a letter by King James to the Scots Privy Council, which is the initiative of the Government policy against this demonstration. It expresses so thoroughly the royal mind and temper, that it announces itself as of the king's own unassisted composition. It begins thus: “We have heard of the late meeting of some of the ministry at Aberdeen, and has seen the copy of all their proceedings, which we find to

savour of nothing else but of sedition and plain contempt of us and our authority ; so we are fully resolved to have these beginnings prevented, and that ane present remeid be rather applied than that by increase of the malady the cure should hereafter be of greater difficulty ; and we have particularly noted such special places whereby their seditious thoughts are clearly discovered which we have sent to you." Among the passages so noted, and the king's criticism on them, the following are specimens. He finds that "they would witness and attest their willingness to the satisfaction to us and our Council, so far as might stand with the Word of God and the testimony of their conscience." On this the comment is : "Now the rule of their conscience being their own conceit and apprehension, they think themselves no farther astricted to our obedience and satisfaction than shall seem to themselves expedient." Another note is : "In making mention of the discharge of their duty, they nominate God, Kirk, and their conscience ; but the mention of any duty to us, their prince and sovereign, is omitted, as if neither nature nor the Word of God had ever directed obedience of subjects to their native princes."

The conclusion is : "We doubt not that these unruly spirits that have convened at this time have directly come under the compass of our law, and may be proceeded against and punished as trespassers in a very high degree, wherein, however, our inclination has been from our native disposition to clemency, and free of all rigour and severity, yet in this we do fear much that lenity shall produce no good effect ; and it being ane great deal better that ane unnecessary member should be cut off, than by the gangrene and corruption of it the haille body should be endangered, we will rather make choice to cause proceed with rigour and extremity against some of these, according to the quality of their crime, than by suffering them to escape with such faults, to make others, upon hope of like impunity, to make no account to commit the like trespass." ¹

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), i. 355.

This letter is dated 19th July 1605. On the 10th of January 1606, the celebrated preacher, John Welch, Knox's son-in-law, and four other brethren, who had furthered the attempt at Aberdeen, were brought to trial for treason. This has a formidable sound, and much was made of it in ecclesiastical controversy; but it had no analogy with an English trial for high treason. One of the peculiarities of the Scots courts was the heavy penalties that might be exacted from those who disobeyed them. It extended to the civil as well as the criminal courts, and the debtor unable to pay the sum decreed against him was denounced as a rebel or traitor for his contumacy in refusing obedience to his majesty's tribunal. Perhaps it was a natural recourse in a country where the law had a continual conflict with people able to give it effectual resistance. If they failed in this resistance, and were at last subdued, there was thus an ample provision of vengeance laid up against them.

These men had been cited before the Court of Secret Council to answer for their conduct in holding an Assembly not only unsanctioned by the Crown, but against a positive order to desist. They declined to admit the jurisdiction of the Council, maintaining that the charge against them concerned matters spiritual, which the civil tribunals were incompetent to treat; and they gave in their "Declinature" in all proper form. They had for their counsel Thomas Hope, who afterwards became celebrated as the lay leader of the High Church Presbyterians at a juncture when their cause seemed to have finally triumphed. The pleadings on both sides are full of technicalities which it serves no real purpose here to examine. To whatever other charges the parties who promoted the prosecution might be amenable, indecent haste was not among them. The case began in January, and the decision was not given till October. The judgment was, that the accused be banished from the king's dominions for life, a punishment that permitted them to choose their own residence anywhere else.¹ Whether this was punish-

¹ Pitcairn, ii. 494-504.

ment or persecution, must follow the decision whether the control of the ecclesiastical assemblies of an Established Church belongs to the Crown or to the Church itself.

There is no evidence that this matter created much excitement beyond Fife and the Lothians, and there the absence of the leaders seems to have withdrawn from the party the old vigour of action and declamation. The Synod of Fife showed more tribulation than truculence in the following causes, for which they proclaimed a fast :—

“The plague of pestilence so long continuing, and the little estimation of the hand of God therein.

“Unseasonable weather in the time of harvest. The distraction of the ministry, and some thereof seeking their own preferment, contrary to the Word of God and constitution of our Kirk. The restraint of General Assemblies, being so needful in time of atheism and Papistry growing.

“The imprisonment of ministers, and restraining them from their flocks at the time wherein God’s judgments are broken forth.

“The not knowing the day of our visitation in things pertaining to our own peace, neither by the seers and watchmen, nor by the people.”

Even the remnant of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, when freed from those fiery spirits which had commanded and driven, exulted in their emancipation. They rejoiced at the manifestations of his majesty’s “just anger” in the imprisonment of such “as the Kirk here has at last been forced to cut off and excommunicate from her society.” And their conclusion is : “We cannot but render most hearty thanks to our God, and acknowledge His blessings towards us in your majesty ; so do we find our obligation increased to meet your majesty in all possible gratitude and duty, according to the bounds of our vocation, most humbly entreating your majesty that this so good a work, so well begun and wisely as yet followed forth, be not interrupted nor left off till it be brought to some good fine and perfection, that the proud and obstinate being sufficiently humbled, and the horns of the wicked, that do push against Christ and your majesty,

His anointed, cutted down, there may be peace and health in Zion, and prosperity within all your majesty's bounds."¹

A different method was taken with Melville, his nephew, and six other brethren. Each of them received a request, or it might be said a command, to go to the English Court, "that his majesty might treat with him, and others his brethren of good learning, judgment, and experience, towards such things as would tend to settle the peace of the Church, and to justify to the world the measures which his majesty, after such extraordinary condescension, might find it necessary to adopt for repressing the obstinate and turbulent." They had a good reception in the secular sense—were amply supplied at table, and found the king affable and jocular. One would value an account of this curious visit from a more easy and descriptive pen than that of the younger Melville, to whom all was a matter of far too much earnestness to furnish an occasion for the amusement of the world. There were debates and conferences of the old kind, with the old arguments for the divine right of Episcopacy on the one hand, and the divine right of Presbyterian Church government on the other.

But one part of the king's project, in its conspicuous originality, stood entirely apart from such common practices. The king was to try the effect upon his guests of a protracted course of attendance on the services of the Church of England in their most solemn and gorgeous form. As some of his acts and sayings have been accepted as indications of remarkable wisdom, of this it may be said that its transcendent folly was sufficient to neutralise the collective wisdom to be found in all his sayings and doings. Let us suppose that some zealous minister of the Old-Light Secession in a moorland district of the west of Scotland is to be reconciled to the old Church. Instead of being gently educated to the change by patient and insinuating Jesuitry, suppose him at once brought in to the performance of high mass in Belgium or

¹ Original Letters to James VI. (Bannatyne Club), i. 166.

Italy, amid the pictures and graven images, the censers, the theatrical motions, the changes of vestment, the adoration of the host, and the other horrors that invest the Scarlet Woman. Suppose, on the other hand, that the dreamy illogical devotee of this worship is to be made alive to the perfect logic of Calvinism, and is for that purpose brought to a cold grey house with a slated roof, within which he is subjected to the three long "exercises" which are the hard day's work of the exemplary pastor, and to the execrable psalmody of his "band" of parishioners. The chances of a favourable impression in either case are much on a par with those of the success of the king's brilliant project.

In fact, the effect produced by it was attested by a Latin epigram, in which Melville turned into grim ridicule the decorations of the communion-table—a clever epigram, which drew much attention in its day. The epigram passed from hand to hand until it reached the king, and Melville was cited to answer for it before the Privy Council. There the storm burst, and Melville again so far lost all temper and decorum as to make a near approach to a personal assault. The chief object of his wrath on this occasion was Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. The scene is told by his nephew :—

"Mr Andrew Melville called; Confessed that he had made such verses, being much moved in his mind by indignation to see such vanities and superstition in a Christian Reformed Kirk, under a Christian king born and brought up in the light of the Gospel most sincerely—before idolaters to confirm them in the same, and grieve the hearts of true worshippers. And being spoken unto by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who sat upmost at the council-table on the right hand, took occasion plainly to his face, before the Council, to tell him all his mind, whilk broke out as enclosed fire in water! He burdened him with all those corruptions and vanities, with profanation of the Sabbath, silencing, imprisoning, and bearing down of the true and faithful preachers of the Word of God; of setting and holding up of antichristian hierarchy and Popish ceremonies. And taking him by the white

sleeves of his rochet, and shaking them in his manner freely and roundly, called them 'Romish rags, and a part of the Beast's mark.' He told him further, that if he was the author of the book intituled 'Scotiseing Genevating Discipline,' he esteemed him the capital enemy of all Reformed Churches in Europe, and would profess him enemy to him and all such proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of all the blood in his body."¹

Such was the effect of the king's knowing project. The Council felt themselves competent to deal with all this as amounting to the offence of *scandalum magnatum*, and Melville was committed to the custody of the Dean of St Paul's, and afterwards to the Tower. The other brethren were disposed of after much harassing pressure and discussion. James Melville was required to take up his abode at Newcastle-on-Tyne, under the sanction that criminal proceedings would be adopted against him if he passed beyond ten miles from that town. By arrangement with the Scots authorities, the others were placed under like restraint in different parts of Scotland. All these doings were of course heavily denounced by the High Presbyterian party, and they did not receive much countenance from any other. If they might not be called a systematic piece of treachery, yet they savoured of an unworthy desertion of the spirit of hospitality. The king's credit in the matter was not improved by a story, generally accredited, how, during some of the harassing contests, he sat in a secret chamber, where unseen he could hear all that was said.

The elder Melville obtained his liberty only on the condition of living out of the king's dominions. Now sixty-six years old, he resumed in some measure his old pursuit of the wandering scholar, taking such employment as he could find in the seats of learning open to his creed. He died in 1620 at Sedan, one of the Huguenot universities. His death was almost unnoticed, and his fame faded away from all memories save those of the remnant of his own peculiar people. His name will not be found

¹ Melville's Diary, 679.

in the biographical dictionaries save in a few of recent times, for his fame in the present day is due to its resuscitation by a man who lived into the present generation.

Melville had many gifts, both good and great ; but they were too great to find full working-room in the age on which he fell. He was an accomplished general without an army. Some might regret that he did not live fifty years earlier; yet it is not easy to realise Knox and him co-operating in harmony, the one acting as lieutenant to the other. There are two positions, either of which might have given him a great name in history. Had it been his lot to lead a haughty ecclesiastical hierarchy, striving to subdue and control secular principalities and powers, he would have made another Hildebrand or A'Becket. It would have suited his genius as well to have led the attack of a band of zealous champions of primitive Gospel doctrine and purity of order, against a voluptuous and corrupt hierarchy choked with riches. The warfare that fell to his lot was in too small a field to develop his powers. He was a man of many accomplishments. Among their fruit his poems hold a respectable place in the '*Deliciæ Poetarum Scotorum*,' and that collection ranked well among the *Deliciæ* of other nations. The accepted writers of the Latin period of European literature appealed to a splendid audience—the whole learned world of Europe. But the countless volumes so eagerly read and criticised in their day now moulder undisturbed on the shelves of great collectors. Buchanan is read because he was a great poetical genius, whose medium for its utterance was the Latin language. But it is the vernacular literature of the later European nations that we now affect; and the desultory gossiping *Diary* of the younger Melville is read when his uncle's pointed and classical epigrams are forgotten.¹

¹ Perhaps Andrew Melville's fame at the present day owes more to the chivalrous and affectionate effort of Dr M'Crie in creating it than to its own intrinsic value. M'Crie was a scholar among a brotherhood whose poverty made scholarship rare among them. Poor and obscure as the Secession were, however, they professed to be the only legitimate representatives of the Church of Scotland in her best days—those of Andrew Melville and Robert Bruce ; and it was a piece

Two things strengthened the king's hands for the course he was taking. The Gunpowder Plot showed that he was not beloved by the Romish party; and the discoveries about the Gowrie Conspiracy swept away all justifiable suspicion that the affair was a plot of his own devising. The Estates lent their supreme power to his plans for the reconstruction of Episcopacy. They passed an Act in 1606 for the restoration of the order of bishops "to their ancient and accustomed honours, dignities prerogatives, privileges, livings, lands," &c. About the honours and dignities there was at the time little difficulty; but we shall presently find that their restoration to the temporalities of the sees was not so hopeful a project. This Act dealing with the dignities and temporalities of the bishops as lords of Parliament, it was deemed desirable that the further legislation, which was to deal more closely with their spiritual functions, should have the sanction of a General Assembly. It was held in Glasgow in 1610. The collective ecclesiastical bodies moulded on the Presbyterian system were not abolished. The General Assembly was to hold its meetings as authorised by the Crown. Of the provincial synods the bishops were to be permanent moderators. Presbyteries were not directly abolished, but it was observed that no place was left for them in the new hierarchy. No acts of discipline or others affecting ecclesiastical rights, as admission and deposition of ministers, were to be valid without the sanction of the bishop. These adjustments were ratified by an Act of the Estates in 1612. The Assembly had further resolved that the bishops should, in all things concerning their life, conversation, and performance of their duties, be liable to the censure of General Assemblies; but this the Estates left unnoticed.

In February 1610, two "courts of high commission" were erected by an Act of the prerogative, one for each province, to consist of bishops, the archbishop presiding.

of natural and legitimate ambition in the man who was their literary ornament to endeavour to show that in the old days they had possessed one of the greatest scholars of his age.

They were afterwards united into one. This project got more notoriety from coincidence of name with the arbitrary tribunal so much detested in England, than by any tyrannies laid to its charge. Its duty was to deal with those questions of scandal and the like, which had been claimed by the Presbyterian sessions and Presbyteries; and as the bishops did not countenance so rigid a system of correction in such matters as their republican predecessors, the high commission, during its short life, was not attended by much national odium. Named by the Crown, it could not assert the high independent prerogatives claimed by the Presbyterian tribunals. In fact the prelates who acted in the new courts found that the Court of Session, as the supreme civil tribunal of the realm, would control their judgments—a prospect which no doubt annoyed them, though it did not cause such a burst of wrath as their predecessors might have uttered against such an outrage.¹

This restoration of the prelates to the nomenclature and outward form of their old prerogatives made no great revolution in the constitution of the Estates. We may find one Parliament, perhaps two, since the Reformation, in which the bishops were not represented in some form or other. The sees had been kept full since the step taken at the beginning of the century, although many of those who were in name bishops had in reality undertaken the character and duties of working parish clergymen, and had no reason to expect the glories in store for them. King James occupied himself in devising suitable robes for Protestant bishops reinstated to the old honours of the order. He was still the schoolboy so delighted with

¹ Archbishop Spottiswood, writing to Lord Annandale, says: "One inconvenience begets always another. The warrant sent home for the Papists of Aberdeen caused the lords grant a suspension of their horning, whereupon I am cited, by the copy enclosed, to answer the last of this month, and produce the decreet of the high commission, with the rest that followed thereupon; which is in effect a subjecting of our decreets to their judicatory, and the disannulling of the commission and authority of it."—Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 769.

his latest novelty that the world must know all about it. He would have a grand public display of all the new finery he had brought into existence. The "riding of the Parliament" was an old procession worked out with great pomp and ceremony on solemn occasions, but otherwise a nominal affair from which people could absent themselves. The king would have the bishops flaunt their new robes in a solemn "riding," and he laid down the order to be held in it: first marquesses, then archbishops, after these earls, then the suffragan bishops, and after them the lesser nobility.¹ The particularity of this was offensive. Heretofore, in the minuting and voting, the spiritual powers came first in order, then the temporal: it was a general separation into two sets, and by courtesy the laymen gave precedence to the clergymen. But here there was a more exact estimate of relative values. Certain clergy were higher than earls, and would take precedence of them; others would follow the earls, but precede the barons.

A defect in the spiritual title of these Scots bishops required a remedy. There was an absolute break in the apostolical continuance of consecration. There were not in Scotland three bishops who had severally been attested by the hands of other three having been laid upon the head of each.² It was necessary, therefore, that the readjusted hierarchy should get its credentials from England. There was some tremor in Scotland lest this necessity might be the opportunity for the Church of England renewing old claims of ascendancy over Scotland; but this was obviated by an arrangement that no English metropolitan should appear in the ceremony. In October 1610, in London

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 382.

² There has been much speculation about the reason why three should be necessary to carry on the line of episcopal descent. My own idea is, that it is an application of the maxim of the civil law that three are necessary for corporate or collegiate action—"Tres faciunt collegium." In its place among the Latin jurisprudents, its merit was of a thoroughly utilitarian character. It was the number that in case of a difference of opinion rendered certain a majority of two to one.

House, the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester laid their apostolic hands on the Archbishop of Glasgow and the Bishops of Brechin and Galloway, who thus returned to Scotland with power to communicate the pastoral attributes to their colleagues.

In the Reformation itself, and in all the ecclesiastical events which followed it in Scotland, the disposal of the ancient property of the Church had a preponderating influence; and it will become necessary to look into the practical results of that part of the Act of 1606 which professed to restore the bishops to their old wealth. The Act of Annexation of 1587 was repealed to the extent necessary to accomplish this purpose. That Act vested in the Crown all estates then in the hands of ecclesiastical persons such as the bishops, or corporations such as the houses of the regulars. But the wealth thus drawn to the Crown was but a fragment of the old ecclesiastical revenues. In the first place, there was an exception of those domains which were converted into temporal lordships, and had thus become the patrimony of great baronial houses. In the next place, all beneficiary interests in the estates which had by those in possession—ecclesiastical or lay—been validly created by conveyances to persons apart, were confirmed. Some of the beneficial interests thus conveyed were mere leases, others were feuholdings, under which the occupant of the land, though holding in vassalage, was the real owner. Many members of the Estates no doubt enjoyed such holdings, and there was a careful provision that they should not be questioned either for the inadequacy of the pecuniary consideration, or any other cause. Thus the Crown came into the rights just as they were held by the ecclesiastical owners, in whose hands many of them had become a barren dominion.

Such as they were, these dominions acquired by the Crown had been for twenty years subject to the risks to which such property is proverbially liable. Wherever there is property held for the benefit of the public at large, there a ceaseless suction is at work, like a dynamic power in nature, drawing it into private hands. States-

men, with all modern appliances against dishonesty and official neglect, know how difficult it is to keep the domains of the Crown from "waste." In that day it was guarded by careless officers ever ready to serve a friend, especially for a consideration in return; these friends were a needy, rapacious, and powerful body of men, ever hovering around the treasure so imperfectly guarded.

The result is shown in the pecuniary difficulties revealed in the personal correspondence of these unfortunate bishops. From the year 1560 downwards, the new Church gave forth a steady wail of poverty. Heretofore it had come from the Church collectively; now it was broken up into the personal grumblings of those whose eminence of position made them the most conspicuous among the sufferers. The poverty of each was the poverty of his see, and their collective grievances are a testimony to insuperable difficulties in the way of the new polity; hence it happens that the confidential communings of a body of respectable gentlemen, touching sources of income and the means of supporting social condition, belong to history.

Even at the beginning of the reconstruction of the hierarchy, when means were open for seizing all opportunities, one of the old ecclesiastical domains, so great that of itself it might almost have supported the new hierarchy, was disposed of by the Estates at the instance of the Crown. This was the domain of the rich Abbey of Aberbrothock. It was conveyed in 1606, as a temporal lordship to the Marquess of Hamilton, whose family had obtained an interest in it before their forfeiture, the second son of the house holding the abbacy *in commendam*.¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, either moved by his own zeal or incited from Scotland, gently remonstrated on this arrangement, saying: "It seemeth that your majesty is about to assure the Abbey of Arbroath unto a certain nobleman, which I could have wished with all my heart might have been annexed to some of your

¹ The Act creating the temporal lordship is in Act. Parl., iv. 321.

majesty's poor bishoprics, the nature of those kinds of livings considered." He hopes at least that two of the parochial clergy will receive certain small holdings promised to them as a provision out of the great domain.¹ The English archbishop, passing from this, says: "Also I beseech your majesty to be good to your Archbishop of St Andrews, that such as have some reservations out of that bishopric may content themselves with the assurances of them which they have already, and that the Parliament may not make them better than they are."²

The brother archbishop for whom Abbot thus spoke a friendly word was George Gladstones. He had become Bishop of Caithness in 1600, and was translated to St Andrews in 1606. He had thus entered the Episcopal service, as it may be called, in the day when it was sought by enthusiasts in the cause of Episcopacy, or adventurers calculating on the chances of the future. Whatever were his views, he who took the place took it without wealth. But now the hierarchy was to be supported as became its new rank and power, and men of position were invited to its honours and emoluments. The celebrated Archbishop John Spottiswood was translated from Glasgow to St Andrews in 1615. He was a man whose honest zeal and

¹ One of these, Patrick Lindsay, minister of St Vigean, makes his moan to the king in the following distinct statement: "Although your highness did write very earnestly unto the Marquess of Hamilton, desiring him, as he would give proof of thankfulness for that great lordship and living of Arbroath freely granted unto him by your majesty, to suffer willingly my little piece of land, with the farms and duties thereof, to be reserved furth of his erection, according to your highness's warrant graciously granted me thereupon, for which I render many humble and hearty thanks; yet, nevertheless, the marquess has sa little regarded your majestys desire thereanent, that he would neither obey the same, nor yet would he and his friends and favourers suffer your highness's warrant to be read nor voted, neither by the Lords of the Articles nor in public Parliament, but has obtained his erection without any reservation."—Original Letters, &c. (Bannatyne Club), 57. This is quite in keeping with the method of transacting business about the Crown estates. The value of such warrants depended much on the strength of the hand which held them.

² Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 55.

decorous life would exempt him from the suspicion of sordid machinations, and the poverty of his provision is only suffered to appear under hard pressure. In 1616 the Privy Council represent to the king a difficulty about the emoluments of the see. Out of the archbishop's revenues a fund had been set apart for the maintenance of the Castle of Edinburgh. The king had written to the Council to restore this fund to the revenues of the see, and to provide for the maintenance of the castle an equivalent out of what is called "his majesty's rents." The Council's answer was, that the captain of the castle declined "to dispossess him of a constant and sure rent under a pretext of that whilk will be uncertain." They further told him that "the constant and sure rent" was provided by Act of Parliament, and could only be revoked by the Estates themselves. The only alternative was, that his majesty should satisfy the claims of the archbishop from the "uncertain" fund.¹ Six years afterwards we see the effect of such equivocal dealings in a private letter, in which the archbishop tells his household troubles to his influential friend John Murray of the bed-chamber:—

"I am glad to understand that his majesty has been pleased to set you on work about these moneys, for thereby I look to come to some end. The burthens that lie upon me that way render my service the less profitable, and force me to live at home and more obscure, except where necessity presses me to attend. To further the service I spared no expense, and made for it upon one occasion or other one-and-forty journeys to Court, whereby it may be soon conceived what bred me these burthens. I left Glasgow, and took myself to a greater charge with less provision, only, as God is my witness, to advance the business, which I knew men, thought more able than myself, would not be so willing unto. Then the time is so fallen out by the cheapness of corns, that the little thing I have will be the less by the half this year than before; so beyond my annuals, little remains to myself—and in

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 495.

what case I should leave my children if God should visit me He knows.”¹

Though he deemed himself better off in Glasgow, yet his successor there had his own troubles. He imparts them to a friend in a circuitous and intricate story, which has, however, a distinct beginning: “I am charged by one John Belschese, advocate, at the instance of Sir Robert Maxwell, to pay him within some six or ten days twelve thousand marks, whereof I gave my bond at the resignation of New Abbey, to assure him of that promise which was made to his majesty to that effect; for it pleased his majesty, not only for his interest then, but to recompense his other services, to grant at my humble entreaty so much to the gentleman. I have no relief or possibility to pay it, being otherwise burdened in my particular estate.”

The transaction appears to have stood thus: Sir Robert had got his hands on certain revenues of the fraternity of New Abbey, popularly called Sweetheart, near Dumfries. The revenues were wanted for the see of Glasgow, and that Sir Robert might be induced peacefully to yield them up, it was desirable to offer him a bribe. The archbishop, by his own admission, furthered this arrangement. Sir Robert, estimating at its proper value the royal promise to pay, required a personal bond or guarantee from the archbishop. A gift of the revenues to the see was issued under the sign-manual; but it was, like many other sign-manuals of that day, checked in its way through the public offices because there were other claimants on the revenues. Sir Robert, finding the royal promise to

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 644. The reference to the cheapness of grain as a source of loss is explained by the practice of either paying or estimating rents in measures of grain. How burdensome his journeys to Court might be he shows in a letter to Lord Ormond, dated 20th January 1624: “The last I wrote to your lordship was by John Auchmuty from Newcastle, wherein I advertised your lordship of our troublesome journey homewards, and the loss I made of two horses: and now all the four are gone, so as I must make new provision. If your lordship conveniently can obtain for me a precept for my charges to the treasury, it will come to this troublesome year in good season.”—*Ibid.*, 737.

compensate him for giving up these revenues equally ineffective, prosecuted the archbishop as his majesty's surety. At the conclusion of his story the archbishop says: "I would entreat you to see if I may have warrant for the passing through of that grant which his majesty signed to me; and I will take some course myself to relieve Sir Robert's debt, upon surety that it shall be repaid to me, or some of mine, when money is more rife in his majesty's coffers."

From the correspondence of the day, one would infer that the Bishop of Galloway was engaged in a multiplicity of lawsuits about his income—sometimes defending himself against aggressive demands, at other times prosecuting defaulters in such matters as this, about the revenues of the Priory of Whitthorn "whereof I can get no duty, whether of feu or tack, so that I am forced to summon all that has interest to these lands, to see their feus reduced for not payment these four years by-past since my entry."² These defaulters to the Church are found acting much like vulgar debtors of modern times. Dealing with his neighbour, Lord Garlies, he tells how "my lord got very reasonable conditions from me, but none are kept. Neither is my duty nor the duty of the ministers thankfully paid, so that I am forced to seek my own at law." He had just held a communing with this lord, when, "in the midst thereof, my lord, fearing I should charge him under pain of horning, conveyed himself the more secretly away in the morning;" in other words, he escaped to avoid an arrest.³

This bishop begins a letter to the king, saying: "For help of my bishopric, so dilapidated by the deed of um-while Bishop Gordon, that it cannot be ane sufficient or honest maintenance to any of that estate, your highness hath been graciously pleased to dispoine to me the abbacy of Glenluce." But the rest of the letter expresses at some

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 444, 445*. The letter is supposed to have been addressed to John Murray.

² Ibid., 733.

³ Ibid., 457.

length that the proper officers refused to pass the gift because the Lord Chancellor had instructions from his majesty for disposing otherwise of the revenues of Glenceluce.¹

The poor Bishop of Galloway gave zealous aid to the king's project for enforcing the Articles of Perth, of which hereafter ; and helped energetically in the establishment of a singing choir in the Chapel of Holyrood House. This last had been a costly service to him, and he complained thus to the king : " It is hard for me to give my own poor portion for restitution of the chapel, and to serve in it, without house-male or stipend ; for in truth I am forced to give all to the prebendaries. I remit this to your highness's gracious pleasure, and yet expects of your princely equity a gracious answer." ²

The Bishop of Dunkeld had his narrative of griefs in keeping with the others ; " Since it has been your majesty's most royal care to restore the decayed benefices in Scotland, and to help their losses with their own patrimony, as any part thereof should fall in your majesty's hands, whilk is the only and fittest way to do the same ; and now the kirk of Cramond falling to your majesty's hands, I could not of duty omit to remember your majesty that that kirk may be restored again to the bishopric of Dunkeld, fra whilk the same was dismembered." He admits that " it may be alleged that Meigle was given in recompense to Dunkeld for Cramond ;" but he explains how, in the course of conducting the business of the exchange, certain rapacious hands got possession both of Cramond and Meigle. " It is marvellous," says the bishop, " as earnest as your majesty has been and is to help the decayed parts of your dilapidated benefices, so, as earnest men have been and are by policy to dismember and overthrow the same." Doubtless few men were ever more in earnest than those who had set themselves to this work. The applicant concludes : " Referring always the same to the greatness of your majesty's wisdom and consideration, out of the whilk I doubt not but your majesty's care will

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 251.

² Ibid., 562, 563.

so help this benefice, that ane honest man may live and serve your majesty therein."¹

The Bishop of Moray had a story affording some variation to these dry legal technicalities. Alexander Lindsay was a favourite boon companion of King James. He accompanied his master in the matrimonial expedition to Norway. There he fell ill, and it was to console him on his bed of sickness that his master wrote that genial letter about "drinking and driving our" already referred to. The letter contained matter still more consolatory—a promise of a temporal lordship out of the revenues of the see of Moray, in these terms: "Sandie, 'till your good hap furnish me some better occasion to recompense your honest and faithful service, uttered by your diligent and careful attendance upon me, especially at this time, let this assure you, on the inviolable word of your own prince and master, that when God renders me in Scotland, I shall irrevocably, and with consent of Parliament, erect you the temporality of Moray in a temporal lordship, with all honours thereto appertaining. Let this serve for cure to your present disease."² This promise was kept, and Lindsay became Lord Spynie. The title came from the bishop's palace or episcopal residence on the borders of a lake a few miles distant from his cathedral in Elgin. Any one who sees at the present day the massive square towers of "Spynie Castle," will pronounce it a fitter residence for a feudal baron than an ecclesiastic; but the Bishop of Moray had rich domains, and they were near the Highlands, so that a fortress served his turn better than a palace.

The new lord, however, was to learn that what came so easily might be easily taken away. To complete his restoration of the hierarchy in 1606, the king wanted back the revenues of the see of Moray. He wrote again to his Sandie, explaining the new arrangements, and the pleasure he felt in discovering, as, with clumsy insincerity, he says, "how willing ye are to surrender your right of that bishopric in our hands." Of course something was

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 232, 233.

² Dalzell's Fragments, 83.

offered as compensation for such a sacrifice ; and that it was not a fair price, even had it been paid, may be inferred from what the king says further in the same letter : “ We desire you will be content with the terms of payment ; and since ye have begun well, let the end be answerable to the beginning, whereof ye shall have no occasion of repentance ; the by-past experience of our favour may assure you also hereafter that ye shall be no loser at our hands.”¹ From what follows it would appear that Sandie was not satisfied with the sufficiency of his royal debtor, and required a bond or obligation from the bishop for a sum of money, whether as an addition to what the king engaged for, or as a resource if the royal obligation should fail. Thus their position to each other was a parallel to that of the Bishop of Galloway and Sir Robert Maxwell.

Soon after this Lord Spynie fell a victim to what was called at the time “ a pitiful mistake.” The executive in Scotland was not yet strong enough to suppress or even mitigate the feudal contests—the wars of neighbour with neighbour—which had been habitual for centuries, except when a strong government, like Murray’s or Morton’s, held them back. They often disturbed the peace of the corporate towns with brawls and bloodshed. The Lindsays were peculiar as a house divided against itself. The heir to their chief honours, the Master of Crawford, was notorious, even among the wild spirits of the time, for deeds of blood and all manner of violence. He lay under an odious imputation—the murder of his relation and benefactor, Sir Walter Lindsay. Sir Walter’s nephews resolved to take vengeance by slaying the murderer. They fell on him walking along the High Street of Edinburgh with their uncle, Lord Spynie. It was a dark night, so that “ they could not know one by the other.” The weight of their onset fell upon the wrong man, and instead of the wicked Master they slew their uncle, the king’s favourite. Such was the fate of the man who had obtained and been compelled to surrender the revenues of the see of Moray.²

¹ Lives of the Lindsays, i. 324.

² Ibid., i. 386 ; Pitcairn, iii. 61 *et seq.*

There was great popular sympathy with the slain man's orphan children ; and their guardian took the opportunity to sue the Bishop of Moray, in name of the young Lord Spynie, for payment of the bond he had granted to their father. The bishop thus tells his story to the king : "Albeit your majesty coft [bought] this benefice of the bishopric of Moray from the umwhile Lord Spynie, yet true it is that the Lord Spynie circumvened me, and got ane bond of mine for ten thousand marks, to have been paid in ten years ; and because I affirmed I would certify your majesty thereof, he promised in his own time to discharge the same for ane less sum. And he being tane away, his brother, Sir John Lindsay, tutor to this Lord Spynie, agreed with me for four thousand and four hundred marks, whilk I paid four years since, not willing that the knowledge thereof should have come to your majesty's ears. But now Sir John Lindsay being also dead, and my bond found registered, this Lord Spynie's curators pursues me for fulfilling that whole bond of ten thousand marks. I most humbly desire your majesty's earnest letter to my Lord Chancellor of Scotland, showing that your majesty is offended that any gear should be sought of me for that whilk your highness paid for sufficiently." On the other side it was pleaded, that "it is not unknown that the said bishop was both of sound wit and good judgment, and could have very weel and advisedly made and set down his own bargain, and would never have been moved to have yielded the said bond but on weighty respects, tending always to his own particular profit and commodity."¹

About this bond there was much tough litigation ; and the bishop, smarting under it, thus appealed to his master : "It may please your most gracious majesty, I am every session here troubled by the Lord Spynie and his curators for that ten thousand marks, so that I am now almost exhausted, and has scarce means to maintain myself so often in Edinburgh to defend the cause, far less able to pay that debt ; and will be forced by time to retire myself, and not to appear to do your majesty's service, unless your high-

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 278, 439-442.

ness's accustomed misericord provide timeously for me."¹ We afterwards find the bishop, in his perplexity, desiring that certain feudal obligations which the Crown held by the letter of the law over the Spynie estates should be exacted, or should be indorsed over so as to be at his own disposal.² It would appear that by a skilful use of this instrument of oppression the young lord was "put to the horn" and declared a rebel, so that the Crown was entitled to take possession of all his property. We find the bishop exulting in his success, since he received a gift from the Crown of his own bond for ten thousand marks, being part of the forfeited estate. But his rejoicing is sadly premature; for in putting in his claim that it may pass the proper offices, he is told that the whole forfeited estate of the Lord Spynie had been otherwise disposed of, so that he might expect to be assailed about his bond by some new holder. And this is not his sole remaining grief. He hears that of the revenues of his see, such as they are, a portion is to be handed over to his neighbour the Bishop of Ross.³

This bishop, who, by the way, was a Lindsay—had his own difficulties. We find a letter by the king to the Court of Session, directing them to "administer justice with as speedy a despatch as the course of our laws can conveniently permit," to enable the Bishop of Ross to recover "sundry rents and commodities" unjustly withheld from him; "whereby, besides his great pains and charges, he is distracted from attending his calling in the Church, far from our intention, which would have him peaceably to enjoy the benefit of that which we have bestowed upon him, that he may be the more able to attend his charge."⁴ The king had just restored to the heir of the house of Balmerinoch the estates forfeited through his father's treason. It will be remembered that the old lord was brought to confess how he happened to shuffle in among some papers laid down for the royal signature that letter to the Pope which brought so much scandal on his master. By the

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 303, 304.

² *Ibid.*, 463.

³ *Ibid.*, 508, 591.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 427.

king's account the son had played a similar trick, but for his own profit, not that of the Church of Rome. The deeds for effecting the restoration contained clauses annexing certain items of the revenue of the see of Ross to the Balmerinoch estate. On the bishop remonstrating against the alienation, King James assumed honest indignation, and wrote to his Privy Council, saying: "We do never remember of any such thing intended by us, and cannot but think that it was procured without our knowledge; for otherwise, if we had been acquainted therewith, we have ever been so careful to have benefices and privileges restored unto the Church that are justly due unto her, that we would never have condescended unto this, which is so far contrary to that course which we do usually keep; and we will omit no lawful means that we may use whereby it may be repaired."¹

Let us now look in upon those outlying districts where powerful men did not embarrass themselves with legal chicanery, but employed simpler and more rapid expedients. A proclamation of the Privy Council in 1623 denounces the Earl of Caithness for several acts of lawlessness, and among others, "that he has these divers years bygone seized upon the Bishop of Caithness, his whole estate and living; for the whilk he is six or seven times denounced rebel, and put to the horn." The Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow represent at the same time to the king "the troubles made to the Bishop of Caithness by the earl of that county, who liveth subject to no law, and debarreth him of his rent and living, hath brought him to such necessity that we are forced humbly to meane his estate to your majesty, especially at this time when he is charged and forced to pay taxation, whereof he cannot get that relief which other prelates have, nor enjoy any of his own rent, and that by reason of the disorder of that part of the country by the earl thereof and his evil example. So unless some course be taken to render the earl obedient, and to supply the bishop's necessities and burthens, he will be forced to quit his place

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 827.

and charge." The bishop himself, in few and modest words, confirms the statement of his brethren: "The disorder of that part wherein your majesty was pleased to prefer me hath so frustrate me of my small rent, and made me so unable to serve into my place, that I am redacted to such extremity, that unless I be otherwise helped I will be forced to quit my place. This hard estate under which I am brought compelleth me to have recourse to your majesty's most gracious favour and care, as to my only refuge, that your majesty would be graciously pleased to make me some relief for supporting of my present necessities."¹

Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles, was beset by difficulties peculiar and exceptional. His pastoral charge lay among a people entirely distinct in manners, institutions, and language, from the Lowland population of the country; and the offices and functions conferred on him were as exceptional as his charge. He was to command an armed force for the purpose of suppressing the conflicts of the clans ranged in hostility against each other. In the year 1611 he received "a commission for life as steward and justice of all the north and west isles of Scotland, except Orkney and Shetland, with the homage and service of the king's tenants in these bounds, and all fees and casualties pertaining to the offices conferred on him." He was thus to keep order in his diocese, with a licence to appropriate to himself, as the revenue of his see, whatever feudal duties he could levy.

The Castle of Dunivaig, in Islay, had been for some time garrisoned by the Crown for the purpose of holding the turbulent district in awe; and in addition to his other civil, or rather military, functions, the bishop was made constable of the castle. The bishop, although it has been said that he kept the Isles in unusual peace during his tenure of the office of constable, was not successful as commander of a fortress. After the bishop had held it for three years, the castle was surprised and taken by a certain Ranald Oig. He was not a legitimate chief or

¹ Original Letters (Bannatyne Club), 707, 708.

leader, but an adventurer, with a band of "broken men" in his service. Hearing of this outrage, Angus Oig, the brother of Sir James Macdonald of Islay, sent round the fiery cross and collected a force for the recovery of the castle. He gave the command of the besieging party to his kinsman Coll MacGillespick, commonly called Coll Keitache, or the Left-handed. Ranald was driven forth, and with his garrison escaped by sea. This recapture was professedly undertaken in all dutiful loyalty to the king and his right reverend constable. But when Angus Oig felt himself master of that stronghold, it appeared that there was something so seductive in the situation that he could not prevail on himself to give Dunivaig over to the constable. Whether it was from this feeling, or that he was doing his part in some deep Highland plots, he held the castle stoutly. In fact Angus and his relations generally were then fugitives from the criminal law—that is to say, for various outrages and defiances of the constituted authorities, accumulated writs had been issued against them, the nature of which was to be fatal to liberty, or even to life, if the persons against whom they stood could only be caught.

This might, at that period, indeed, be called the chronic position of any Highland chief towards the law and the Government. Angus's brother, Sir James Macdonald, was then a prisoner in the Castle of Edinburgh under sentence of death. The ordnance and munitions supplied to Dunivaig as a Government fortress were on a scale far beyond the armaments of the Highland chiefs. The temptation to keep the place was strong. A crowd of adherents gradually gathered round Angus, and he threw out auxiliary works round the castle. The bishop meanwhile, in addition to his other coercive powers, obtained from the Privy Council "letters of fire and sword," and prepared for an attack on the castle. Angus took the tone of a humble supplicant—he would naturally do what he could for his own safety; but let the Government grant him "remission" or pardon for all his offences, and he would readily and gladly yield the castle. A remission was sent to him through a herald, but that was not satis-

factory—he would deal only with the bishop himself. The bishop collected what force he could ; but whether it was that the clans which called themselves loyal shunned the service, or that, as it was charged against him, he called his levee during the few days in which the people of the district could gather in their harvest and means of living for the year, it so happened that the bishop had a scanty following. On landing near Duni-vaig, he found the place swarming with enemies. Angus now laughed at the proffered remission, destroyed the boats which had brought over the party, and told them he would put them to death, bishop and all, unless they left hostages in his hands of sufficient importance to enable him to treat with the Government. Under this pressure, the bishop left behind his son and his nephew, with other hostages, and was permitted to move off with the remnant of his army.

The bishop, in his tribulation, hastened to make known, that whatever he did for the relief of the hostages should not compromise his majesty's Government. "Far be it from me," he says, "to enter under condition and trust with that false generation and bloody people. Yet I must, first for the relief of my friends out of the irons, and thereafter out of their hands, be their slave, and promise to do, and do what I have credited to do, as they direct me. But yet, by the grace of God, shall never promise nor press to do anything in their favour that may offend his majesty, or touch his highness in honour or profit." And again: "There are many ways to overthrow that whole generation, notwithstanding somewhat be yielded to some of them for the eschewing of the danger of the men's lives who are in their hands." The hostages were extracted from the fortress while yet it remained in the hands of Angus Oig. He complained loudly of promises broken and treachery of divers kinds ; and it is not unfair to the bishop's memory to believe that he practised the accepted Highland diplomacy of the day, the fundamental principle of which was, that no faith was to be kept with the Celt. As he said in confidence to his friend John Murray of the bedchamber: "Albeit I must always deal for the relief out of these villains' hands of my dearest friends, yet I am

nowise obliged to do them great good, who has kythed themselves to have neither fear of God, care of their due obedience to their sovereign king, nor yet faith or truth to their neighbour."

There was a long contest before the bishop's mishap was retrieved and Dunivaig recovered for the Government. A considerable land and sea force was concentrated round the castle. On the other hand, the people rallied stronger and stronger on the appearance among them of their natural leader, Sir James Macdonald, who escaped from the Castle of Edinburgh. This war, as we shall see, inaugurated a partial revolution in the Highlands by the extension of the influence of the Campbells.

While the Bishop of the Isles was thus involved in the wars of his diocese, his brother—holding spiritual rule over the more distant group of islands—the Bishop of Orkney, felt himself in the hands of a successful rebel and usurper. Patrick Stewart, Earl of Orkney, was running that career for which he was hanged in Edinburgh. He fortified his own castle and the strong tower of the adjacent Cathedral of St Magnus. He had a navy as well as an army, adopted so far as he could the pomp and ceremony of an independent court, revolutionised the laws of the islands, and proved the completeness and independence of his power by acts of oppression and cruelty. The new sovereign did not adopt King James's policy of "no bishop, no king," as one may without hesitation infer from this account which the bishop of his dominions gives of his own condition: "I am wearied with much travail; my means are wholly spent; my debt is unpaid; my losses are so great that I cannot see how to recover any part thereof; and I am not able to hold out any longer, but must needs either depart the country for debt, or beg—which I am ashamed to do—or apply to some other thing to maintain me, if his majesty, now shortly after so long time, take not order with me."¹

It is a slight relief to these gloomy and querulous revelations to find Adam Bellenden, Bishop of Dunblane, rejoicing in a gleam of good fortune; but it is only a gleam,

¹ Original Letters, &c., 360.

with shadows behind it. His story would be spoilt in any telling but his own ; and it is the more curious as it reveals at least one strange resource from which the king seems to have tried to relieve the poverty of his Scots hierarchy :—

“ I did write to your lordship on the receipt of the five hundred pounds sterling whilk his gracious majesty was pleased to send unto me. I think such a sum came never in a better time, and the Lord ever bless his majesty that had that remembrance of his poor servant. I know not, neither does it become me to inquire anent that money; but I must humbly crave your lordship’s advice on this particular, and I beseech your lordship to write to me your answer.

“ When I was in England his majesty did promise to me the making of two sergeants-at-law, and I travailed with some to that effect, with whom I covenanted if they were made sergeants by my means, they should give me eleven hundred pounds sterling the piece, and the projector a hundred pounds of it for his pains. Now I have received ane letter, that these same men are called to be sergeants, and has received his majesty’s writ to that effect, and desires me to write to them anent that indenting. I beseech you to know if his majesty’s will is I be paid by that course or not. If it be, it will be to me a good, well and great. If his majesty will not, far be it from me to offend his majesty in any matter, having received his favour in a beginning—albeit, alas ! it does small to my burdens. I will attend his majesty’s pleasure and leisure in the time and manner of all ; for I will not be taxed of avarice for all my wants, and importune pressing so gracious a sovereign of whose bounty I have tasted. Albeit, if against Martinmas I get not some farther, I will find trouble again. As ever I may serve your lordship, try if by that course of sergeants I may expect help or not, and advise me,” &c.¹ There is here the foreshadow of a suspicion, which no doubt was confirmed, that of two thousand and two hundred pounds which the bishop looked for, seventeen hundred had been

¹ Letter to Viscount Ormond ; Original Letters, &c., 726.

somehow intercepted, and he must content himself with the dividend of some twenty per cent on his claim.

This collection of sordid exposures may serve as a practical commentary on a reproach uttered by Calderwood at a mixed meeting where bishops and Presbyterian ministers were squabbling: "It is an absurd thing to see men sitting in silks and satins, and crying 'Poverty! poverty!' in the mean time when purity is departing."¹

If there were no better reason for hunting out and exposing to view all these small items of personal history, something might be said for them as revelations of the social condition and character of the times. They have a broader political bearing, however, though it is not likely to be well seen by those who have not studied the events of a period thirty years later. What we have to carry out of the whole selfish and cunning struggle is the determined pertinacity of the hold maintained by powerful men in Scotland over the revenues of the old Church. In the separate battles in which, by a combination of craft and force, each individual holder baffled the Government in its attempts to endow the new hierarchy, we see the training of those who were getting ready to show a combined front against any national measure likely to assail their personal interests. But before that struggle came we have still to tell of a succession of acts which, done in peace and in the spirit of promoting the cause of religion, were yet preparing the elements of national discord.

¹ History, vii. 251.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

62. Book, history of the church of Scotland

65. Letters to Arth. Beaton (Scotland Club)


381. Anne of Denmark - Rufford

444. Sir Francis - Gifford



Date Due

[illegible]



3 9031 01211820 4

BURTON, J. H.

Boston College Library
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.

Books may be kept for two weeks unless a shorter period is specified.

If you cannot find what you want, inquire at the circulation desk for assistance.



